

A SECOND
COLLECTION
OF
CONTROVERSIAL LETTERS

Relating to the

Church of *England*,
AND THE
Church of *ROME*,

As they passed between

An HONOURABLE LADY,

AND

Dr. *GEORGE HICKES*.

To which is added,

A LETTER written by a Gentlewoman
of Quality to a Romish Priest upon her
Return from the Church of *Rome* to
the Church of *England*.

AND

An ANSWER to some QUERIES sent by
a Roman Catholick to a Divine of the
Church of *England*.

WITH

An APPENDIX to the Controversial
LETTERS.

LONDON, Printed by W. B. for RICHARD SARE at
Grays-Inn-Gate in *Holbourn*. 1710.

A SECOND
COLLECTION
OF

CONVERSATIONAL LETTERS
RELATING TO THE

Church of England

AND THE

Church of Rome

AN HONOURABLE LADY

AND

OF COUNTESS



A LETTER
OF COUNTESS
RECEIVED FROM THE CHURCH OF ROME
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND
AND

AN ANSWER TO THE CHURCH OF ROME
A ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH OF THE
Church of England

WITH

AN APPENDIX TO THE CONVERSATIONAL
LETTERS

London: Printed by J. B. Nichols, 1801.

T H E
Dedicatory Epistle.

HONOUR'D MADAM,

YOUR Ladyship's Letter of the
11th of October last was one of
the most welcome to me that I ever re-
ceived, as being a Testimony under your
own Hand, and in your own words, that
I had not lost my Work, and Labour of
Love bestowed upon you, but that at last
you had received great Satisfaction, and
as far as you were able to judge of your
self, that I had confirmed, and fixed you
in the Reformed Church of England, in
which by God's Grace you purposed to live,
and die a faithful Member. **MADAM,**

The Dedicatory Epistle.

this declaration is also a Testimony of your Sincerity in professing to me all along, that Satisfaction was what you sincerely sought after, and I thank Almighty God, who often chooses weak things to confound the mighty, that you have attained so great a Blessing by the feeble Endeavours of so mean an Instrument in his Hands as I, to his Praise, and Glory in the Sense of my own Insufficiency most humbly acknowledge my self to be. I heartily rejoyce with you in the Satisfaction you have received, and I think my self bound to thank your Ladyship for your hearty Prayer to God to reward me for the Pains I have taken with you; and I heartily join my Prayer to yours, that from him, who abundantly compenseth all our charitable, and sincere Undertakings for the good of others, I may receive the promised Reward. You are also pleased to tell me, that you shall esteem the Book, as a valuable Present, and therefore I present it to your Ladyship in this publick manner, because it may invite others, especially of your Sex,
who

The Dedicatory Epistle.

who are unsettled, as you were, to read those Arguments, and Answers, which by God's Blessing have establisht, and settled you.

You will find in it a particular, and full Answer to that fallacious Paper, which help'd to unsettle you, and to which I promised your Ladyship, by God's Assistance to make an answer. And for your Ladyship's farther Confirmation, you will also find in it a Letter, which a Gentlewoman of Quality sent to the Romish Priest, who had seduced her, upon her return from the Church of Rome to the Church of England. There is also in it a good Answer to some Queries, which were brought by a Gentlewoman in such an unsettled Condition, as your Ladyship lately was in, to another Divine of the Church of England, in reading of which I hope your Ladyship will have the Pleasure of new Satisfaction from such Arguments, as you gave me no Occasion to use, or not to insist upon. MADAM, These additional Pieces,

The Dedictory Epistle.

to this Collection of our Letters will afford your Ladyship fresh Entertainment, and help to add something to the small value of an inconsiderable Present, which comes with all respect to offer it self to your acceptance from

Your Ladyship's

Most faithful; and

Obedient Servant,

Ormond-street, No.
vember 1, 1709

GEORGE HICKES.

T O T H E
R E A D E R.

I Had not published these *Controversial Letters*, but for the sake of a Paper, which the *Lady* brought me from the Person, who had mightily unsettled her, before I came acquainted with her, and with the Approaches her *Ladyship* had made towards the Church of *Rome*. The Reader will find it in the 9th Page of this Book, where the Title of it will tell him it was written in *Answer to some Passages in Dr. George Hickes's Book, i. e. to some Passages in his Book mentioned in the* * *Margin*. I had reason to think, if I had not made a publick Reply to this Paper, it would have been privately dispersed in MSS. or Print among the *Roman Catholicks*, as an Answer to that Book; and therefore I made the Reply to it, which the Reader will find at the 46th Page: Though in the ill Condition of Health I was in, I had much rather have let it alone, if my Silence to that Paper would not have given too much Advantage to my Adversary, and probably have tempted the good *Lady*, to whom he gave it, to believe that I did not, because I could not make any Reply to it. This Reply obliged me to publish the whole Series of Let-

* Several Letters, which passed between Dr. George Hickes, and a popish Priest, &c. London, Printed for Richard Save at Gray's Inn-Gate in Holborn. 1705.

ters, which passed between me, and her *Ladyship*, of which the Reader must look upon the *Appendix* as a *Part*, and may be pleased to read them after the 45th Page, as if they had been printed in order there. They came to me after the Book was printed off, and when I did not expect them, and that is the reason, why I was fain to make an *Appendix* of them.

The Lady, who wrote the Letter to a *Romish Priest*, was Mrs. *Susanna Hopton*, Relict of *Richard Hopton* of *Kington* in *Herefordshire*, Esq; one of the *Welsh* Judges in the Reigns of King *Charles II.* and King *James II.* And the Priest, to whom she wrote it, was Father *Turbeville*, a Person in his time of great Note, and Authority among those of his Communion in *England*. She fell sick of a very sharp Feavour at the latter end of *June* last, which she bore with uncommon Courage, Patience, and Resignation, and died of it in the Faith and Communion of the Church of *England*, and constant to her Principles, at *Hereford* in the 82^d. Year of her Age, on the 12th of *July* following, about two of the Clock in the afternoon. But almost two Years before she died, she gave me leave to publish her Letter, which I thought would be proper to be added to these *Controversial Letters*; and I hope it may have good Effect upon all those of her Sex, who are so ready to be drawn away by the subtle Artifices, the Slight, and Craftiness of the *Roman Missioners*, whereby they lie in wait to deceive. What was the occasion of her Fall, and what by God's Blessing of her Recovery, I need say nothing; because she gives an Account of both in her Letter, in which the Reader will find she had very well studied the Controversie between the two Churches, and very well understood it; and he need not wonder at it, when I have told him, that she made her self as perfect in it, as reading *English Writers* could make her,

who

who managed the Controversie on both sides. I have above twenty Popish Authors, which she left me, and some of them with Marginal Notes in her own Hand. And on the other side she was very well versed in Bishop *Moreton's*, Archbishop *Laud's*, and Mr. *Chillingworth's* Works, and *Ran- chin's* Review of the Concil of *Trent*, thought worthy to be put into English by those two famous Men Doctor *Christopher Potter*, and Dr. *Gerard Langbaine*, the great Ornaments of *Queen's College* in *Oxford*: The latter of which translated it into English at the request of the former, and dedicated his Translation to him, which he published at *Oxford*, 1638.

Thus her *Genius* led her to Controversie, and Dispute, and made her take great Delight in reading the Controversial Pieces on both sides betwixt the Champions of the two Churches, and diligent in collecting what she liked out of our Writers. One may observe in her Letter some borrowed Expressions, which she took out of *the Antidote of Popery*, which the Reader will find between the two Letters in the *Appendix*, and of which I shall hereafter give an Account. She let me copy her Letter fourteen Years ago at her own House, and as soon as I had thoughts of printing it with my own, I sent her Notice of it, and asked her Consent, with Liberty to revise it: Both which she gave me, with a Commission to alter any thing in it I thought was not so right, or proper, or so clear, as it should be. In a Controversial Letter written about nine and forty Years ago the Reader will imagine there must be several old, and now unfashionable Words, and Expressions taken out of Authors before that time: These I took the Liberty to change for others, more in present use, and a little to alter the Method of her Letter, and also to enlarge it here, and there in a few places where I thought it was too short;
but

but I have not in the least altered her Notions, or the Substance of what she wrote, nor added any thing new to it, but an Answer to an Objection against the Church of *England* now very much in fashion among the *Roman Catholicks*: viz. *That she is in Communion with no other Church.* This Objection, which they think is matter of reproach, was brought, and urged to the good old Gentlewoman about three Years ago, and she sent it to me for an Answer, which I returned much the same in effect as the Reader will find it in Page 145. That which invited me more particularly to introduce it, and the Answer to it into her Letter, was the Consideration of the *Lady* to whom I wrote my own Letters; for she made this Objection to me at a Conference we had together, as the Reader will find, p. 7. though afterwards she did not insist upon it; and not knowing if it had yet been considered by any other Writer, I took this Occasion to insert it with the Answer to it, as a part of *Mrs. Hopton's* Letter, that if it had not a publick Answer before, it might have one now. I also took upon me to add Notes upon some Passages in her Letter, which perhaps if I had not mentioned, the Reader would not have thought to be hers.

I have already spoken of her Diligence in reading Books relating to the *Popish Controversie*, and her making Collections out of them. And I beg leave of the Reader farther to acquaint him, that she was not less studious in reading Books of Devotion, and gathering the choicest Flowers out of them. That excellent Book of Devotion without her Name, Entituled, *Daily Devotions, consisting of Thanksgivings, &c. By an humble Penitent*, was her collection, and Composition, of which she communicated some few Copies in MS. by which means, as I suppose, it came to be printed at *London* for *Jonathan Edwin*, 1673. In the beginning of the Preface it is said, *The following Meditations, Praises, Prayers,*
and

and Confessions were the Devotions of a learned, and pious Christian, humbly offered up in due Order. This Edition I conceive might be occasioned by a MS. Copy out of a deceased Clergy-Man's Study, who was taken to be the Author thereof. For it was afterwards set forth with this Title Page; *The Humble Penitent, or Daily Devotions, consisting of Thanksgivings, &c. With a preparative Exercise to a good Death.* To which is added, *The Sacrifice of a Devout Christian, or Preparations to the worthy Receiving of the Blessed Sacrament.* By a late Reverend Divine of the Church of England. The Fifth Edition. London, printed for Matthew Gilliflower, 1703. In the beginning of the Preface of this Edition the words in the former are thus altered; *The following Meditations, &c. were the Devotions of a most learned, and pious Divine of the Church of England.* In this Edition the *Latin Prayer* at the end of the former is left out, and as to the Additional Part; *The Sacrifice of a Devout Christian*: The true Author of the Book told me it was not of her making, nor did she know by what Hand it was done. Yet there is an Hymn at the end of it, which is taken out of the LAUDS for our Saviour's Office in the Devotions in the ancient way of Offices, of which I may now tell the World, she was the Reformer; which confirms me in my conjecture, that the DAILY DEVOTIONS consisting of Thanksgivings, &c. tho' hers, was printed from a MS. of a venerable deceased Clergy-man of Herefordshire, with whom she had intimate Correspondence, and who esteemed the admirable DEVOTIONS in the daily way of Offices, as much as she did. I have two more MSS. of her Composition, both Books of Devotion; one in her own Hand, and the other an English Hexameron, transcribed fair, and ready for the Press, Entituled, *Meditations upon God's Works in the Creation of the World.* And as she was a great reader, and maker
of

of Books of Devotion : So she devoutly exercised her self every Day constantly, and regularly in holy Offices both in her Cloſet, and in her Family, and to her daily Devotions added *Alms* in ſuch a beneficent Chriſtian manner, as her private Almoners, and the places where ſhe lived can better tell, and teſtifie, than I can now deſcribe.

The Third Part of this little Book, viz. *SOME QUERIES ſent by a Roman Catholick to a Divine of the Church of England*, was written by a learned Prieſt of the Church of *England*, lately deceased, Mr. *Samuel Graſcome*, M. A. of *St. Mary Magdalen's College* in *Cambridge*. Before his Deprivation he was Rector of *Sturmouth* in *Kent*, and ſince he was deprived, made and published the following Treatiſes againſt our Adverſaries of the Church of *Rome*. 1. *The Separation of the Church of Rome from the Church of England founded upon a Selfiſh Intereſt*, Quarto, 1691. 2. *CERTAMEN RELIGIOSUM*, or a *Diſpute* between a Papiſt, and a Proteſtant, 8°. &c. 1704. 3. *CONCORDIA DISCORDS*, or ſome *Animadverſions on a late Treatiſe*, Entituled, *An ESSAY for Catholick Communion*, &c. Octavo, 1705. IV. *An ANSWER to a Book*, Entituled, *A ſhort, and plain way to the Church*, compoſed many Years ſince by *Richard Huddleſton* of the *Engliſh Congregation* of the Order of *St. BENEDICT*, and now published by his Nephew, *John Huddleſton* of the ſame Congregation to gain Proſelytes to the Church of *Rome*, being a neceſſary preſervative for all Perſons againſt *POPERY*, Octavo, 1703. This laſt Book ſo pleaſed Mrs. *Hopton*, that ſhe ſent the Author of it, who was a Stranger to her, a Teſtimony of her Approbation of it. For ſhe knew Father *Huddleſton* very well, and in her Letter to me, wherein ſhe expreſſed the Satisfaction ſhe received in reading of it, ſhe told me, ſhe ſhould be glad before ſhe died to ſee an Answer to
Dr. Thomas

Dr. Thomas Bayly's Book, Entituled, *An End to Controversie between the Roman Catholick, and Protestant Religions*, printed at Doway 1654. And that she would give five Pounds to encourage the Undertaker of so good a Work. I could not but mention this for several Reasons. *First*, To acquaint the World that our Adversaries of the Church of Rome boast very much, that this Book was never yet answered. *Secondly*, To tell my Opinion, that I think so arrogant a piece of such an insolent^b Apostate ought not to lye for ever unchastised. And, *Thirdly*, To let the Reader know one Occasion and Motive, which invited me to join Mr. *Graſcome's* Answer to the *Queries*, and Mrs. *Hopton's* Letter to Father *Turbeville*, together with my own Letters into one Book. Mr. *Graſcome* wrote, and published other Pieces since he was deprived, which I cannot mention, because I have them not by me; and as to this *Answer* to the *Queries*, it was found in his own Hand-writing among his other Papers, and I have reason to think from the Force, and Plainness with which it is written, that I shall not be blamed for preserving of it by putting it in Print.

As for the ANTIDOTE against POPERY between the two Letters in the *Appendix*, I took it out of a Book in Octavo, with this *Title-Page*: SACRED PRINCIPLES, SERVICES, and SOLILOQUIES, or *A Manual of Devotion made up of Three Parts, &c.* The *Third Edition*, with some Additions. London, Printed by T. N. for John Clark, 1656. The worthy Author, who then only stiled himself PHILO-CHRISTIANUS, was^c Dr WILLIAM BROUGH, who for his Piety, and Learning, as well as great Sufferings, and Loyalty, was promoted by King Charles I. to the Deanery of Gloucester, and after

^b Athenæ Oxonienses. Vol. I. Col. 485, 487.

^c Athenæ Oxonienses. Vol. II. Col. 731.

the Restauration of King *Charles II.* had other Preferments conferred upon him, which upon many accounts he deserved. I had the first Notice of this Book, and Tract from the *truly* Honourable Mr. *Archibald Campbell*, and have printed it again for the sake of the worthy *Lady*, with whom I have been so long engaged in a Controversie, in which I shall never write more. I thought it very proper for her, because it was plain, and short, and that by God's Blessing it might contribute to her Resettlement in the Church of *England* by the strong, and lively Reasonings in it; but if it had not had that Effect upon her *Ladyship* it would have served to convince her, and all, who shall read this Book, of my Zeal, and Charity in endeavouring to prevent her deplorable straying from the English to the Roman Fold, and from changeing a most pure for a most corrupted Religion, by which she must have run a manifest, and most deplorable Risque of her Soul.

As for the whole Book, with its *Appendix-part* I hope it may be serviceable to those of the Clergy, or others, to whom Objections happen to be brought, or sent for Answers, or *Fallacies*, and Sophisms to be solved, from the *Romish* Missioners, who abound in all parts of the Nation, and by consequence may save them some Pains. I think there are few, or none of either, that have not received their Answers, or Solutions in this, or my ^d former Tracts written by God's Call, and Assistance upon several Occasions in defence of our Church against that of *Rome*.

^d An *Apologetical Vindication* of the Church of *England* against her Adversaries, who reproach her with the English Heresies, and Schisms. The Second Edition. London, Printed, 1706.

SEVERAL LETTERS which passed between Dr. *George Hickes*, and a *Popish Priest*, &c. London, Printed for *Richard Sare*, at *Grays-Inn-Gate* in *Holbourn*, 1705. To which let me add *Speculum Beata Virginis*, or a Discourse of the due Praise, and Honour of the *Virgin Mary*.

In

In this the Reader will find the Holy *Eucharist* asserted to be a *Commemorative Sacrifice*, in which the Bread represents the Body of Christ, which was broken and wounded to death, and the Wine his Blood, which was shed upon the Cross, and I think myself obliged to observe this, to let the Reader know, that I have not alter'd my Opinion concerning that ancient Doctrine, which a ^c late Writer hath treated very rudely as false and dangerous, and me, for asserting of it, with an Air of mighty Superiority, and in a most distinguishing manner of Disrespect. This is not a place for a Reply to his Answer. But as I am preparing a Third Edition of my *Two Treatises of the Christian Priesthood*, and *the Dignity of the Episcopal Order*: So if it please God to spare me so much time, and Health, as to finish it, I shall without any other Defence obviate, rather than answer his chief Objections, or *Cavils* against that Doctrine, which so many of our greatest Men have asserted to be the Doctrine of the purest Ages of Christianity, without seeing any Danger in it, or any Consequence from the old commemorative, representative Sacrifice to the new Popish *Sacrifice of the Mass*. Wherefore to the eminent Writers, which I formerly cited for that Doctrine, whose Names are in ^f the Margin, I beg leave to add the Authority of others, who may in the mean time serve to cover me, and the Doctrine of the Christian Sacrifice from the Obloquy, and ill Usage of my Adversary, if either I, or that may be supposed to need a Defence.

^c Dr. John Hancock.

^f Bp. Overal, Bp. Andrews, Archbishop Laud, Mr. Mede, Dr. Jeremiah Taylor, Dr. Heylin, the Compilers of the Scottish Liturgy, and before them the Compilers of the first Liturgy of Edward VI. Bp. Stillingfleet, Bp. Bull, Dr. Grabe, Dr. Brevint, Bp. of Sarum.

I shall begin with a Book, Entituled, *A Discourse concerning the Worship of God towards the Holy Table, or Altar.* Printed at London, 1682. But as I understand it was printed from a MS. Copy, which a learned Clergy-man, since deceased, some where met with: So is it plain from the Book that it was written about the Year 1637. This Book a learned Gentleman prepared for the Press two Years ago, and intended to give it this Title, which he thought more proper for it, than that which the first Publisher gave it; viz. *The Christian Priesthood, Altar, and Sacrifice vindicated, &c.* Who was the Author of this little Book I cannot tell, but thus he writes in the 20, 21. and 22. Pages of it: *Having proved an Altar, by your own Consequence we must have a Sacrifice too, and a Priesthood, for these you say infer one another as Correlates.* But I will not be beholden to you to make this my Argument, but will prove it out of Scripture the word Sacrifice to be applied to our Sacrament. God by his Prophet foretels the Jews, that whereas they had polluted his Altars, he had also rejected them, and their Sacrifices, and would appoint himself a new People, and a new Sacrifice. In every place (that is not in Jerusalem only, and in one place) Incense should be offered unto his Name, and *Sacrificium purum*, a pure Sacrifice, or Offering, for so the word signifies in the Hebrew. Now what other Incense have we but Prayer? What other Sacrifice but the Lord's Supper? Which he calls a pure Sacrifices, or Offering, which God hath appointed to commemorate the Death and Sacrifice of his Son instead of the Jewish Sacrifices, which only typified it. This is the Interpretation of the most, and most ancient Fathers; for among all the ancient Fathers both Greek, and Latin there is nothing more frequent, than the use of the word Sacrifice, Priest, Altar, when they speak of the Sacrament, Holy Table, and Ministers of the Gospel. No Man can deny this,

this, that hath but cast his Eyes upon their Writings, which are every where full of these Expressions. He that shall vilifie their Authority in this, let him give me better for the contrary, or I shall conclude him Ignorant or Impudent, &c. The Doctor, if he pleases, may observe this.

The next Authority shall be that of Archbishop Bramhall in his ^a Answer to *de la Militiere*: We acknowledge a Representation of that Sacrifice to God the Father, we acknowledge an Impetration of the Benefit of it, we maintain an Application of its Virtue: So here is a commemorative, impetrative, applicative Sacrifice. Speak distinctly, and I cannot understand what you desire more. To make it a Suppletory Sacrifice, to supply the Defects of the only true Sacrifice of the Cross, I hope both you, and I abhor. So in his Discourse of ^b Protestants Ordination: These words give sufficient Power to consecrate (for how should he administer, that cannot consecrate) and also to Sacrifice, so far as an Evangelical Priest doth, or can Sacrifice, that is a commemorating Sacrifice, or representative Sacrifice, or to apply the Sacrifice of Christ by such means, as God hath appointed. But for any Sacrifice, that is meritorious, or propitiatory by its own Power, or Virtue, I hope the Author will not say it, if he do, he will have few Partners. So in another place of the same ^c Discourse: He who saith, take thou Authority to exercise the Office of a Priest in the Church of God, doth intend all things requisite to the Priestly Function, and among the rest to offer a Representative Sacrifice to commemorate and to apply the Sacrifice, which Christ made upon the Cross. But for any other Sacrifice distinct from that, which is Propitiatory, Meritorious, and Satisfactory by its proper Virtue, and Power, the Scriptures do not authorize, the Fathers

^a Page 36 of his Works. ^b Ibid. p. 585. ^c Ibid. p. 993.

did not believe, the Protestants do not receive any such. So again in another ^k place of that Discourse: *Again, receive Power to administer the Holy Sacraments. For all the essentials of their Sacrifice are contained in our Celebration of the Holy Eucharist, that is according to their Schools, the Consecration, and the Consumption of whole, or part. Both these we have as well as they, the former more purely than they, in as much as with us both Priest, and People receive, with them the Priest only. It was therefore truly said by the learned ^l Bishop of Ely, Take away your Transubstantiation, and we shall have no Difference about the Sacrifice. I shall here only observe to the Doctor, that Archbishop Bramhall said We, as well as Bishop Bull, whom the Doctor ridicules for speaking in the plural Number.*

To the Archbishop's Authority, let me add that of Dr. Brough in his Tract, printed in the Appendix: *In the Sacrament of the Eucharist a Sacrifice commemorative both grant, but a Propitiatory we disclaim.*

In the next place let me produce the Testimony of Mr. Thorndike in the III. Book of his Epilogue, &c. There Chap. ii. p. 9. *But the Discourse by which the Apostle persuades Christians to separate themselves from the Jews, Hebr. xiii. 10, 16. is most pertinent to this purpose, as that which is not to be understood otherwise. Though when he saith, we have an Altar, whereof those, who serve the Tabernacle, have no Right to eat, I allow that by an Altar he means metonymically a Sacrifice, or we can give no reason what he meant to argue, that the Jews have no right to the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, which Christians pretend not to eat of in any Sacrifice, but in the Eucharist. And surely if we consider, but the Name of Eucharist, we cannot think it could have been more properly signified than*

^k Ibid. p. 995.

^l B^e. Andrews.

by calling it the Sacrifice of Praise, the Fruit of the Lips, that confess the Name of God. For when he proceeds to exhort, not to forget communicating their Goods, do we not know, and have we not made it appear, that this must be by their Oblations to the Altar, whereof the Eucharist being first consecrated, the rest served the Necessities of the Church. So Chap. v. p. 40. It is evident, that this commemorative, and representative Sacrifice is of the nature, and kind of Peace-Offerings, which by the Law those, who sacrificed, were to feast upon. I will take the Cup of Salvation, and call upon the Name of the Lord: I will pay my Vows now in the Presence of all his People, saith the Psalm cxvi. 12, 13. and that in answer to the Question made: What Reward shall I give unto the Lord for all the Benefits that he hath done unto me? At feasting upon the Parts or Remains of Peace-Offerings the Master of the Sacrifice began the Cup of Thanksgiving for Deliverance receiv'd; in consideration whereof he pays his Vows; and the Sacrifices which he pays are called *תודה*, or Sacrifices of Thanksgiving for Deliverance received. Is not this the same that Christians do, in celebrating the Eucharist, setting aside the difference between Jews and Christians? Wherefore I have shew'd, that it is celebrated with Commemoration of, and Thanksgiving for the Benefits of God; especially that of Christ crucified. And I have shew'd, that it is called by the Apostle the Sacrifice of Praise, the Fruit of our Lips giving Thanks to God: And that having shew'd, the Jews have no Right to it as a propitiatory Sacrifice; that is, not to it; because not to the propitiatory Sacrifice, which it representeth: But therefore, that Christians have a Right to feast upon it, as the Jews upon their Peace-Offerings. The Celebration of the Eucharist is the renewing of the Covenant of Grace, which supposeth Propitiation made for the Sins of Mankind by that one Sacrifice,

which it commemorateth, and representeth.—*Shall it be a Breach upon Christianity to say also, that it is such a Sacrifice, whereby we make God propitious to us; and obtain at his Hands the Blessings of Grace, which the Covenant of Grace tendreth? This indeed requireth yet farther Consideration; for what Reasons the Sacrament of the Eucharist may be accounted, and call'd a Sacrifice, that we may be able to judge, in what Sense, and for what Reason it may be accounted propitiatory, and impetratory, without Prejudice to Christianity. First, then let it be remembered, that by the Institution and Ordinance of God, those that dedicate themselves to the Service of God in the Faith of Christ, by Baptism, are to dedicate their goods to the Maintenance of the Communion of the Church in the said Service, the chief Office whereof is the Celebration of the Eucharist, proper to Christianity, as I shew'd a little afore. Then be it observ'd, that there were two sorts of Oblations commanded by the Law, and practis'd by God's ancient People. For first Fruits, Tythes, and accursed things (that is things dedicated to God, under a Curse upon them that should convert them to any other use, Levit. xxviii.) were not dedicated to be spent upon the Altar in Sacrifices, but to the Maintenance of the Temple, or of them that attend upon the Service of it. But seeing we have now shew'd, that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice; it follows that those Oblations which are dedicated to God, to be spent in the Celebration of the Eucharist, (in reference whereunto I have already shew'd, that all Oblations of Christians are consecrated to God, because dedicated to maintain the Communion of his Church, whereof the Eucharist is that Office, which is peculiar to Christianity,) are not barely consecrated to God, but to the Service of God by Sacrifice. For those things which under the Law were consecrated to God, to be sacrificed upon the Altar, were*

not then first offered to God, when they were killed, and the Parts of them burnt upon the Altar; but from the time that they were declared God's Goods for that purpose: As by the Law it self may appear, in the Precept of the second Tithe, which for two Years belonging to the Poor, the third Year was to be spent in sacrificing at Jerusalem; and so by Law, and by no Man's Act, consecrate to the Altar, Deut. xiv. 22, 29. Inasmuch then as I have shew'd, that the Eucharist is a Sacrifice, in so much, and for that very Reason, that which Christians offer to God for the Celebration of the Eucharist, is no otherwise a Sacrifice, than those things, which were appropriated to the Altar under the Law, were Sacrifices; from the time that they were dedicated to that purpose; saving always the difference between Sacrifices figurative of the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross (such as Christianity supposes all the Sacrifices of the old Law to be) and the Commemoration, and Representation of the same past, which I have shew'd that the Eucharist pretendeth. And truly having shew'd that this Representative and Commemorative Sacrifice is of the Nature and Kind of Peace-offerings, in as much as it is celebrated on purpose to communicate with the Altar, in feasting upon it; and knowing that every Beast that was sacrific'd for a Peace-offering was attended with a Meat-offering, and a Drink-offering of Wine, which are the Kinds, in which the Eucharist is appointed to be celebrated; I must need say, that those Species, set apart for the Celebration of the Eucharist, are as properly to be call'd Sacrifices of that Nature which the Eucharist is of, (to wit Commemorative and Representative) as the same are to be counted figurative under the Law, from the time that they were deputed to that use. This is then the first Act of Oblation by the Church, that is, by any Christian that consecrates his Goods, not at large to the Service of God, but peculiarly to

the Service of God by Sacrifice; in regard whereof the Elements of the Eucharist, before they be consecrated, are truly counted Oblations, or Sacrifices. But having resolved to set all Regard of Faction behind the Consideration of Truth manifested by the Scriptures; I stick not to yield, and to maintain, that the Consecration of the Eucharist, in order to the Participation of it, is indeed a Sacrifice, whereby God is rendred propitious to, and the Benefits of Christ's Death obtained for them, that worthily receive it. But this perhaps neither in the Sense, nor to the Interest of them, who make it their Business to maintain the present abuses of the Church of Rome, by disguising the true Intentions, and Expressions of the Catholick Church.

From these Authorities I pass to that of Dr. Beverege, late Bishop of St. Asaph, who in his viiith Sermon on 1 Pet. xi. 5. Speaking of the Sacrifices, by which the Saints praise God, expresses himself thus. *First, therefore a Sacrifice in general is properly something, that we give or offer to God for our own: For tho' we have nothing but what he first gives us; yet when he hath given it to us, we have a civil Right to it: It is our own in respect of all other Men: But when we give it back again to God; divesting our selves of our own Right to it; and transferring it wholly to him; then he looks upon it as a Sacrifice offer'd up to him; and is pleas'd to accept of it as such.* Then having enumerated the several sorts of Jewish Sacrifices; he proceeds to speak of the Sacrifices, which are offer'd up by the holy Christian Priesthood, to set forth the Glory of God; as publick Prayer, Praise, and Thanksgiving; in the conclusion whereof he speaks thus: *But the Sacrifice that is most proper, and peculiar to the Gospel, is the Sacrament of our Lord's Supper, instituted by our Lord himself, to succeed all the bloody*
Sacrifices

Sacrifices in the Mosaick Law: For tho' we cannot say, as some absurdly do, that this is such a Sacrifice, whereby Christ is again offer'd up to God, both for the Living, and the Dead; yet it may as properly be call'd a Sacrifice, as any that was ever offer'd; except that which was offer'd by Christ himself: For his indeed was the only true expiatory Sacrifice, that was ever offer'd: Those under the Law were only Types of his; and were call'd Sacrifices only upon that account, because they typify'd, and represented that, which he was to offer for the Sins of the World: Therefore the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood may as well be called by that Name, as they were: They were typical, and this is a commemorative Sacrifice: They foreshew'd the Death of Christ to come, this shews forth his Death as already past: For as often, saith the ^a Apostle, as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death till he come. This is properly our Christian Sacrifice; which neither Jews nor Gentiles have any Share in; as the Apostle observes. ^o We have an Altar, whereof they have no Right to eat, which serve the Tabernacle. An Altar, where we partake of the great Sacrifice, which the eternal Son of God offered up for the Sins of the whole World. So in his private Thoughts upon Religion, pag. 124. And as Baptism thus comes in the place of the Jews Circumcision: So doth our Lord's Supper answer to their Passover: Their Paschal Lamb represented our Saviour Christ; the sacrificing of it, the shedding of his Blood upon the Cross: And as the Pass-over was the Memorial of the ^p Israelites Redemption from Egypt's Bondage: So is the Lord's Supper the Memorial of our Redemption from the Slavery of Sin, and Assertion into Christian Liberty, or rather it is a solemn, and lively Representation of the Death of Christ; and offering it

^a 1 Cor. xi. 26.

^o Heb. xiii. 10.

^p Exod. xii. 14.

again to God, as an Atonement for Sin, and Reconciliation to his Favour. So that I believe, this Sacrament of the Lord's Supper under the Gospel succeeds to the Rite of sacrificing under the Law; and is properly call'd the Christian Sacrifice; as representing the Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross. So in his Sermon upon the great Necessity, and Advantage of frequent Communion, upon 1 Cor. xi. 26. In which words we may first observe, that every time the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is administred, his Death is thereby shewn, and declar'd to all that are there present; as when the Jews eat the Paschal Lamb, the Master of the Family declar'd the Reasons why they eat it with bitter Herbs; and why with unleavened Bread, and the like: So here when we eat the Bread, and drink the Cup, according to Christ's Institution, we thereby declare the Reasons of it, tho' not by word, yet by the very Act it self, and the several Circumstances of it: By the breaking of Bread we declare Christ's Body to be broken, and wounded to Death: By the Cup we declare his Blood to be shed or power'd out for the Sins of the World: And by distributing both the Bread and the Cup to each Communicant apart, we declare to everyone particularly, that Christ died for his Sins; and that he may be saved by Christ's Death, if he will but receive, and apply it to himself as he ought, by a quick, and lively faith. In the next place we may here observe, that the Apostle doth not say, that Christ's Death is repeated, or that he is offer'd up again, every time this Sacrament is administred; but only that the Lord's Death is shewn by it. And therefore that this is not, as the Papists absurdly imagine, a propitiatory Sacrifice for the living, and the Dead; but only commemorative, and declarative of that one Sacrifice, which Christ once offer'd to be a Propitiation for the Sins of the whole World. And then after shewing the various Offerings, by which the People

of God under the Law had the Death of Christ typify'd and represented to them; he concludes thus: *There were many such ways, whereby the People of God in those Days were constantly put in mind of what the Saviour of the World was to do, and suffer for them; all which are now laid aside, and only this one Sacrament of his last Supper instituted by himself in the room of them: This is now our Christian Shew-bread, whereby we shew the Lord's Death, till he come. This is our Burnt-offering, our Sin-offering, our Trespass offering, our Thank-offering, our Meat-offering, our Drink-offering, and all the Offerings requir'd of us, whereby to commemorate our Blessed Saviour, and what he hath done for us: And therefore, as the Jews were punctual, and constant in observing all things prescrib'd to them for the same end: We certainly ought to do this as often as we can: This one thing, which answers the end of all their Offerings, and yet hath neither the Trouble, nor the Charges, nor the Difficulty of any one of them.* So in his Church-Catechism explained, p. 144. He saith, *that the Sacrifices under the Law were not expiatory in themselves, but only Types, and Shadows appointed by God to foreshew, and represent the Death of Christ, then to come. And in like manner the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is now ordained by him to set forth, and commemorate the same Sacrifice, as now already offered up for the Sins of Mankind. Which therefore is necessary to be continued to the end, as the typical Sacrifices were from the beginning of the World.*

From this learned Prelate I proceed to a learned Presbyter, who is not pleased to let us know his Name in his second part of the *Clergy man's VADE MECUM*: In the Preface to which he writes thus: *Some have with Vehemence insisted, that whenever Alterations are to be made, the first Collect in the Post-Communion should be inserted between the Consecration,*

secration, and Administration; or some Prayer of Oblation added in that place. Now tho' I am fully convinced, that the Eucharist may as justly be call'd a Sacrifice, as any, save that offered on the Cross; yet I can see no Necessity for any such Alteration. The Consecration-prayer, and the words used by the Priest at the Administration, seem sufficient, if rightly understood, and apply'd. In the Consecration-prayer Christ is said by the Oblation of himself upon the Cross, to have made a full, and perfect Sacrifice; And in our Saviour's Words of Institution, inserted into this Prayer, the Bread is call'd his Body, given, i. e. sacrificed for us; the Wine his Blood, shed as a Libation for us, i. e. for the remission of our Sins, as follows presently after. Nothing then can be more clear, than that the Eucharist is hereby declar'd to be a Sacrifice; and in the words of Administration, the Merits of it are apply'd to every Receiver. The Body of Christ, which was given for thee (and is now exhibited to God in thy behalf) preserve thy Body, and Soul to eternal Life. No wise Man is for Alterations, but in case of apparent Necessity; which I cannot perceive in the matter now before us. 'Tis true the Eucharist is so commonly styl'd the Oblation, or Sacrifice, in the following Codes, that if the Prayer of Oblation had continued in the place, where it first fix'd in Edward VI's Time, it might very well have been justify'd by the common Practice of the ancient Church, and even by the Scripture it self: But I fear that an Alteration of this sort, as things now stand, might be attended with no good Consequences.

So in his Note on the 2d Apostolical Canon: Let the Bishop or Priest be deposed, that offers at the Altar any thing, besides the Institution of the Lord, &c. It is clear from this Canon, saith he, that the Bread and Wine for the Communion were offer'd to Almighty God in the Primitive Church. Irenæus in the 2d Century speaks of this Practice, this is

still retain'd in our Church: For after the Alms for the Poor, and other Devotions of the People have been humbly presented, and placed upon the holy Table by the Priest; as also so much Bread and Wine, as he shall think sufficient; the Priest shall say, Almighty and everlasting God, we humbly beseech thee most mercifully to accept our Alms, and Oblations: For as the Word Alms relates to the Money collected for the Poor; so the word Oblation refers to the Bread and Wine, which is in this Canon call'd the Institution of our Lord. The Offering of First Fruits in the Church is mention'd also by Irenæus; and as for Lights, they were absolutely necessary in the Church, while Christians held their Assemblies in the Night, or before Day, as they were forced to do, during the times of Persecution. Bishop Beverege shews from Hippolytus, who wrote in the beginning of the 3d Century, that the Use of Incense in the Church was introduced before that time; and 'tis evident from this Canon, when it was used, viz. at the time of the holy Oblation. And here it is to be observ'd, that not only the presenting the unconsecrated Elements to God, was called an Oblation; but that the Consecration it self was attended with a solemn Presentation of the Symbols of the Body and Blood of Christ to the Father; therefore this holy Memorial was call'd a Sacrifice, an Oblation, &c. and the holy Table an Altar: But it was not reputed a Sacrifice expiatory for the Sins of Quick and Dead, as is now in the Church of Rome.

To these Testimonies I may add what Dr. Potter the learned Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford hath written in the 5th Chapter of his *Discourse of Church-Government*. 'But there is yet a farther Reason, why none but Bishops, and Presbyters have ever consecrated the Lord's Supper, viz. because the Lord's Supper was always believed to succeed in the place of Sacrifices: Consequently, as

' as none beside the High-priest, and inferior Priests
 ' were permitted to offer Sacrifice under the Jewish
 ' Law; so the Lord's Supper was consecrated by
 ' none, but Bishops, and Presbyters, who alone are
 ' Priests in the Christian Sense of that Name. Here
 ' then it may be remembred, that in the ancient Sa-
 ' crifices both among Jews, and Heathens one part
 ' of the Victim was offered upon the Altar, and a-
 ' nother reserved to be eaten by those Persons
 ' in whose Name the Sacrifice was made. This
 ' was accounted a sort of partaking of God's Table,
 ' and was a federal Rite, whereby he owned the
 ' Guests to be in his Favour, and under his Protection
 ' as they by offering Sacrifices acknowledged him to
 ' be their God. There are Examples of this in *Ho-*
 ' *mer*, &c. to which there are frequent Allusions in
 ' the Scripture, &c. In the Christian Church there
 ' is only one proper Sacrifice, which our Lord of-
 ' fered upon the Cross, and consequently Christians
 ' cannot partake of any Sacrifice in a literal and strict
 ' Sense, without allowing Transubstantiation. Lest
 ' therefore they should want the same Pledge to as-
 ' sure them of the divine Favour, which the Jews
 ' enjoyed, our Lord appointed the Elements of Bread,
 ' and Wine to signify the Body, and Blood offer-
 ' ed in Sacrifice, where they are expressly called his
 ' Body, and Blood, it being common for *Represent-*
 ' *atives* to bear the Name of those things, and Per-
 ' sons, which they represent; *And as they were*
 ' *eating, Jesus took Bread*, &c. The Elements were
 ' not his *real Body*, and *Blood*, nor understood to be
 ' so by the Apostles, or any primitive Father, but
 ' they were the Symbols of his Body, and Blood,
 ' the partaking whereof is all one to the Receivers,
 ' as if they should eat the Body, and Blood of Christ
 ' offered upon the Cross. To this purpose is the
 ' following Discourse of St. Paul: *The Cup of Bles-*
 ' *sing*, &c. 1 Cor. x. 16, 21. Where it may be observed;
 1. That

1. That eating the Lord's Supper is the same Rite in the Christian Church with eating the *things offered in Sacrifice* among the *Jews, and Gentiles*.
 2. That it is an Act of Communion, and Fellowship with God, at whose Table we are said to be entertained, and therefore it is declared to be inconsistent with eating the Gentile Sacrifices, which is an Act of Communion with Devils, to whom those Sacrifices are offered. 3. That it is an Act of Communion among Christians, who eat at the same Table, and by that means are owned to be Members of the same *Evangelical Covenant* under *Christ*. Whence the Apostle declares in another place, that the *Jews*, who are not within the *Christian Covenant*, and consequently not in Communion with Christ, and his Church have no Right to partake of the *Christian Altar*: *We have an Altar* (says he) *whereof they have no Right to partake, who serve the Tabernacle*. Hence it is manifest that to partake of the Lord's Supper, is to partake of the Sacrifice of Christ, which is there commemorated, and represented. For which reason the most primitive Fathers speak of eating at the *Christian Altar*. *He that is not within the Altar*, says Ignatius in the Passage, which was cited in the last Chapter, is *deprived of the Bread of God*. Where by the Bread of God he means the *Sacrament*, which God imparts from Christians to his own Table, which this Father calls the *Altar*. And the Lord's Supper is called an *Oblation*, a *Sacrifice*, and a *Gift*.^a Thus in Clemens of Rome: *It is no small Crime, if we depose those from their Episcopal Office, who have unblameably, and holily offered the Gifts*. Where he manifestly takes this Phrase of *offering Gifts* in the Sense, wherein the *Jews*, and our Lord used it: *If thou*

^a Ad Corinth. Epist. I. Cap. xlv.

' bring thy Gift unto the Altar, says our Lord, and
 ' there remembreſt, that thy Brother hath ought a-
 ' gainſt thee, leave there thy Gift before the Altar;
 ' and go thy way, firſt be reconciled to thy Brother,
 ' and then come, and offer thy Gift. Where Gift is
 ' put for Sacrifice. *Juſtin Martyr* in ſeveral pla-
 ' ces of his Dialogue with *Trypho the Jew* calls the
 ' Eucharift a Sacrifice: Having cited the Paſſage of
 ' *Malachi*, where God tells the *Jews*: I have no
 ' Pleaſure in you, neither will I accept an Offering
 ' at your Hand: For from the Riſing of the Sun
 ' even unto the going down of the ſame my Name
 ' ſhall be great among the Gentiles, and in every
 ' place Incenſe ſhall be offered up unto my Name,
 ' and a pure Offering, &c. He makes this Comment
 ' upon it: He that is God then foretold the Sacri-
 ' fices, which are offered to him by us Gentiles,
 ' namely, the Eucharift of Bread, and Wine, where-
 ' by he ſaith we glorifie his Name, but ye *Jews* pro-
 ' fane it. Afterwards he hath theſe words; we
 ' (*Chriſtians*) are the true Notion of God's Priests,
 ' as God himſelf witneſſeth, when he ſaith, that in
 ' every place among the Gentiles they ſhall offer to
 ' him pure and acceptable Sacrifices: For God ac-
 ' cepts Sacrifices from no Man, but his own Priests.
 ' And therefore he foretells that all thoſe ſhall be
 ' acceptable to him who ſhall offer in this (*Jeſus's*)
 ' Name the Sacrifices, which Jeſus Chriſt directed
 ' to be made, namely thoſe, which are made by the
 ' *Chriſtians* in all places in the Eucharift of Bread,
 ' and Wine. *Ireneus* calls the Eucharift, the Ob-
 ' lation of the Church, which our Lord directed us
 ' to offer through the whole World, which, he ſays,
 ' is accounted by God a pure Sacrifice, and is accep-
 ' table to him. In another place, where he ſpeaks
 ' of our Lord's inſtituting the Eucharift, he hath

* Lib. IV. Chap. xxxiv.

† Lib. IV. Cap. xxxii.

these words: He taught the *new Oblation* of the
 New Testament, which the Church hath received
 from the Apostles, and *offers* through the whole
 World. And in the Fathers of the next Age to
 consecrate the Lord's Supper is so constantly called
 Περσφίρειν in *Greek*, and *offerre* in *Latin*, that is
 to *offer it*, that is needless to cite any Testimonies
 from them. So that it is plain both from the De-
 sign, and Nature of the *Lord's Supper*, and from
 the concurrent Testimony of the most primitive
 Fathers, who conversed with the Apostles, or their
 Disciples, that it was reckoned through the whole
 World to be a *commemorative Sacrifice*, or the Me-
 morial of our Lord offered upon the Cross, which
 being first dedicated to God by Prayer, and Thankf-
 giving, and afterwards eaten by the *Faithful*, was
 to all Intents the same to them, as if they had
 really eaten, the natural Body, and Blood of Christ
 which are *thereby represented*. The Consequence
 whereof, as explained by the constant Practice of
 the Church in all Ages is, that they, who conse-
 crate the Sacrament, must be *Priests* in the Chri-
 stian Sense of this Name, as was before observed.
 But it is not to be wondred, that those of the *Re-*
formed Religion wholly abstained from the Names
 of *Sacrifice*, and *Oblation*, or mentioned them with
 Caution, and Reserve in explaining this *Sacrament*,
 which were used by the primitive Fathers in a ve-
 ry true, and pious Sense, since they have been so
 grossly abused by the *Papists* in their Doctrine of the
Mass, which depends upon their other absurd Do-
 ctrine of *Transubstantiation*, which is the daily
 Occasion of many Superstitions, and Idolatrous
 Practises, and hath for several Ages given infinite
 Scandal both to the *Jews*, and *Gentiles*, and to
 the Church of God.

What

What I have transcribed from this learned, and judicious Author may be resolved into these Propositions.

I. That the Eucharist is the Sacrifice, or Oblation of the Christian Church, which our Lord directed to be offered through the whole World, and that this Sacrifice was always believed to succeed in the place of all other Sacrifices.

II. That it is plain from the Nature, and Design of the Lord's Supper, and of the concurrent Testimony of the most primitive Fathers, who conversed with the Apostles, or their Disciples, that the Lord's Supper was reckoned through the whole World to be a commemorative Sacrifice.

III. That Bread and Wine [the Materials of this commemorative Sacrifice] are the Representatives, of Christ's Body, and Blood, and that partaking of them is all one to the Receivers, as if they had received the Body, and Blood of Christ, which are thereby represented.

IV. That these Representatives of the Body, and Blood of Christ are first dedicated to God by Prayer, and Thanksgiving, and afterwards eaten by the Faithful.

V. That therefore this Sacrifice cannot be the one proper Sacrifice, which our Lord offered upon the Cross, because Christians cannot partake of it in a literal, and strict Sense without allowing Transubstantiation.

VI. That Bishops, and Presbyters, who consecrate this Sacrament, [or offer this commemorative Sacrifice] are Priests in the Christian Sense of that Name, and the true and pious Sense of the Fathers, though not in the unchristian, false, and impious Sense of the Papists, which makes them Transubstantiating Priests, who offer the same Sacrifice in the literal, and strict Sense, that Christ offered upon the Cross.

These Propositions contain all that I have said of the Christian Sacrifice, Altar, and Priesthood in my Discourse of the *Christian Priesthood*; and why Dr. *Hancock* did not dignify himself, and the Title-Page of his *Answer* to me with the learned Professor's great Name, as well as those of Bishop *Bull*, and Dr. *Grabe*, is no very great Riddle, though he can best tell what his Reason was.

For as the Professor and I happened to write at the same time: So we have both cited the same Fathers, and the same Texts of Scripture, and consequently all his Cavils (for so I call all his Arguments, and Objections in his Answer, and in his *Patris Vindicati*) are as much against him, as me. Dr. *Hickes*, and his Fathers, is one of the Doctor's Figures of Contempt, both of them, and me; and if he had pleased, he might have used the same repeated Elegancies of Dr. *Potter*, and his Fathers; which had he done, I take upon me to say, the Professor would have esteem'd it an Honour to suffer Reproach for the Fathers, as I have had the Happiness to do. I own my self a Son of those Fathers to all the World, and hope I am one of their true Sons; and for their Justification against all his undutiful Speeches against them after the Example of his Father *Daille*, and for his better Instruction, I send him to Mr. *Reeve's* Preface before his Translation of their *Apologies*, and to his *Preliminary Dissertation* to *Vincentius Lirinensis*; where he may learn good Manners towards the Fathers, and then with some Humility censure himself for despising them. As there is a Succession of Doctrines in the Christian Church: So there is a Succession of Persons from whose consentient Testimonies we learn those Doctrines, and therefore it can be no Service to Christianity to weaken the Reputation, and Authority of those Primitive Doctors, and of their concurrent, unanimous Traditions as the Men of Latitude ever did, and ever

will do. But *hoc Ithacus velit*, the Enemies of Christ, and Christianity of all sorts are pleased with it: It helps to do their Work, and the Doctor need not doubt but the *Author of the Rights*, and the rest of that *Gang*, chuckle to see him pelt the Fathers with his small Shot, by whose united, and consentient Testimony we batter down the Ramparts they have of late in vain raised against the Priesthood, and the Church. But though he almost ridicules me with the *Fathers*, yet he is loth I should have the Reputation of being thought conversant in their Writings: This he suggests to his Readers, who may wonder at his singular Candor, when they shall know, that he is as great a Stranger to my Method of Studies, as he is to my Person; and likewise observe that for fear the good use I have made of them in my Discourse of *the Christian Priesthood*, should shew I am no Novice in their Writings, he intimates with exemplary Manners, as if I was not able to write it without the help of "Dr. Grabe, as if it were a Detraction to any Man's Reputation to be help'd by so great a Man, whose help hath so much improved the Works of Bishop Bull, and particularly that very Book, for which He received the Thanks of the Clergy of France. If the Bishop thought it no diminution of his Honour to be help'd by the Doctor, his help had been no Dishonour to me, had I been so happy, as to have it: But alas! I had not the Favour, and Advantage of the learned Gentleman's help, nor one single Quotation of any Father from him, nor was he privy to my making that Discourse, though had I had Opportunities, I should have consulted him, and accepted his help, could I have had it in every Page of that Discourse. I mention these things to let my Readers see, by what an uncommon sort of Adversary I have been attack'd;

and the worst I wish him is, that he had been better acquainted with Dr. *Grabe*, and would have ask'd not only his Help, but his Directions and Advice, before he published his *Answer*, and then I am persuaded he had never made it publick, at least not published it with so much Contempt of the Holy *Fathers*, and of the most rational Method of beginning and proceeding in the Study of Divinity with them in order of Time, which he despises, and from what Causes the Contempt of that Method of Study comes, I leave Dr. *Grabe*, and all other learned Divines to judge. I could say a great deal more, were it needful, in Vindication of it, and of the *Fathers*, but I will only tell him a Story I have by Tradition of the learned Dr. *Rich. Montague*, in his time Bishop of *Norwich*, and leave him to make the Application. A Gentleman made a Request to this great Man to put a young Student of Divinity in the Order of Priesthood, of whom he gave a very good Character; upon which the Bishop promised to ordain him, if he found him fit for that Holy Order, and desired him to send the young Gentleman to him. When he came, the Bishop told him he had received a very good Character of him, but however he must according to his Custom examine him himself for his better Satisfaction. Immediately upon this he asked him what Divinity he had studied? *My Lord*, replied the young Man very briskly, *I have read Calvin's Institutions thrice over.* How saith the Bishop, Calvin's Institutions thrice over. Yes, reply'd the young Man again, *thrice over, my Lord.* Indeed, said the Bishop, you have done more than I have done, for *I am not got so far by four hundred Years.* The ingenious young Man presently apprehended the meaning of the Bishop's Answer, and prudently told him, he was sensible he had begun his Studies in Divinity at the wrong end, and wished the Time he had spent in reading

of *Calvin*, he had spent in reading the Primitive Fathers, and promised his Lordship to alter the Method of his Studies, to which the Bishop encouraged him with many Reasons, and particularly with this one: That he would never be well able to judge when modern Writers of Divinity were in the right, and when in the wrong, or to distinguish true from erroneous, new from old, or particular from generally received Doctrines, or to know the true Sense of the Scriptures relating to the Faith, Government, and whole Constitution of the Church, but by knowing the consentient Doctrine and Practice of the more ancient Fathers, which was not to be learn'd as it ought to be by Divines, but out of their own Writings; which, said he, for the first Four Centuries may be read over with moderate Diligence in a few Years. In short the good Bishop gave him the same Rules, which *Vincentius Lirinensis* laid down for discerning Truth from Error almost Thirteen hundred Years ago, to join the Tradition of the *Catholick Church* to the Scriptures, and in all Doubts, and Disputes to chuse those Doctrines, that were believed, and professed at all Times, and in all Places, and by all the Faithful, and always to follow Antiquity, Universality, and unanimous Consent. This he told him was the Pole-star by which he was to sail in his Voyage after Truth, and the Touch stone whereby he was to try all modern Writers, and Writings in Matters of Religion, the Writings of *Calvin*, and all the other Reformers not excepted; and I hope Dr. *Hancock* hath nothing to object against this Test, by which ancient Councils both *General*, and *Provincial* tried all Doctrines, and redargued all Sects, and Hereticks; but if he hath any Objection or Exceptions, he hath liberty (and now more liberty, than ever) to make them when, and in what manner he will.

But

But to return from this Digression to the enumeration of Authorities, in the next place I produce that of the most learned Ecclesiastical Antiquary, the Reverend Mr. *Joseph Bingham* in the First, and Second Volume of his *Origines Ecclesiasticae*, or *Antiquities of the Christian Church*. In the 170th Page of the First Volume he recites the Council of *Neocaesarea*, which in the 12th, and 13th Canons determin'd, *that the Country-Presbyters should not* " offer the Oblation, *nor distribute the Bread, and Wine in time of Prayer in the City-Church, when the Bishop, and Presbyters are present, &c.* In p. 263. he shews, *that part of the Deacon's Office was to receive the Peoples Offerings, and present them to the Priest, who presented them to God at the Altar.* These Offerings which were presented to God at the Altar, were of three sorts: First, Of such as were offered in Thankfulness to God for his Benefits, as the first Fruits of Corn, and Grapes, secondly for such as were offered for the Uses of the Church, as Oil, and Incense: thirdly the *Bread, and Wine*, which were offered to be spent in the *Eucharistical Sacrifice*, and for what different Ends these different sorts of Offerings were brought to the Altar, and how they were distinguished, may be seen Canon. Apost. Cap. iii. and in Canon xxviii *Concil. Trull.* and the Notes of *Balsamon*, and *Zonaras* upon them. But to proceed, the same learned Author in p. 267. writes thus: *The Council of Nice, which was not long after that of Ancyra, says expressly that Deacons had not Power to offer; that is in the Sense, in which Offering signifies Consecration, for in that Sense it was the proper Office of Presbyters* ——— *St. Hilary is a good Witness of the Practice of the Church in his time, and he assures us there could be no Sacrifice, or Consecration*

of the Eucharist without a Presbyter; and St. Jerom saith the same, that Presbyters were the only Persons, whose Prayers consecrated Bread, and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. For which reason speaking of Hilary a Deacon, he says he could not consecrate the Eucharist, because he was only a Deacon. The Reason of this was because the Holy Eucharist was looked upon as the prime Christian Sacrifice, and one of the highest Offices of the Christian Priesthood; and Deacons being generally reckoned no Priests, or but in the lowest Degree, they were therefore forbidden to offer, or consecrate this Sacrifice at the Altar. So p. 269. The Bishop was never used to offer Sacrifice without his Minister, or Deacon. So Vol. ii. p. 118. By the same Law the Bishop to be ordained — was to repeat the Form of Prayer used at the Oblation of the Holy Eucharist, and at Baptism with the other Prayers of the Church. So p. 94. In every Church they should give place to the Bishop, that was a Stranger, to offer the Oblation, or Sacrifice — and be invited to preach and offer the Oblation. P. 347. with what Care, (saith St. Chrysostom) ought the Priest to behave himself — especially when he invokes the Holy Ghost, and offers up the tremendous Sacrifice of the Altar. So p. 369. If a Presbyter (saith the Canon) — shall presume to offer the Oblation in a separate Assembly, or set up another Altar against him, let him be Anathema. Dr. Hancock would do well to consider here, what that was which the Bishops, and Priests were to offer in the Holy Sacrament, what were the Materials of their solemn Oblation, or Sacrifice, what Things they were, which they

² Ut peregrino Episcopo locus sacrificandi detur.

³ Ad oblationem consecrandum invitantur.

— Si quis forte Presbyter — putaverit separatim Deo Sacrificia offerenda, vel aliud erigendum Altare, Anathema sit.

consecrated, or offered. Is it not evident they were the *Bread and Wine*, which they first dedicated upon the Altar, and then by proper, and solemn Invocations, and Prayers consecrated into the mystical, or sacramental Body, and Blood of Christ? These Creatures of Bread and Wine, these external material Symbols of the separate Body, and Blood of Christ, that were crucified, and shed upon the Cross, were the *Matter* of their solemn Oblation, as is plain enough from these Citations, and shall (God willing) be made still more plain from the Offices of the Church. Bishop *Andrews* understood them to be the *Matter* of this Christian Sacrifice, as may be seen by this Prayer in his *Greek and Latin Devotions*.

Ὁ ἀνω τῆς πατρὸς (ὕψιστος)
καὶ ὅς ἐστι ἡμῶν ἀποστόλος (ὑμῶν,
ἔλθε εἰς τὸ ἀγιασθαι^a τὰ προσέμνητα δῶρα.
καὶ ἀπὸ ὧν, καὶ δι' ὧν, καὶ ἕνεκα^b ὧν
προσκομιζόντ).

*Qui sursum cum Patre sedes
Et invisibilis hic præsens nobiscum es,
Veni, ut sanctifices dona proposita
Pro quibus, & à quibus, & quibus de Causa
Offeruntur.*

Thou who sittest above with the Father, and art invisibly present with us, come and sanctifie these Offerings which are before Thee, for whom, and from whom, and for what Reasons soever they are offered to Thee.

^a P. 214, 215. ^b Const. Apost. Lib. VIII. Cap. xiii: τὰ προσέμνητα δῶρα ταῦτα ἐνάπιοις. Cap. xiii. καὶ ἐν ὧν τὰ προσκομιζόντ) καὶ δι' ὧν τὰ δῶρα. See the whole Prayer in *Goars Enchologium*. p. 81.

I had not perhaps cited this Passage, but to obviate a Reflection the *Doctor* hath made upon one of the most eminent and venerable Gentlemen of his Time, and most eminent Writer of Devotions, whose Books have been received in so many Editions, for which he hath had the Thanks, and Prayers of the generality of the Clergy and Laity, I mean Mr. *Nelson*, against whom he directs these Words in the Preface of his Answer: *But to bring these Notions into Books of Devotion, as a certain ingenious Gentleman hath lately done, is still a greater Sign of their Zeal in this matter.* This is said by him after charging us with a Zeal to propagate new Notions plainly contrary to the Declarations of the Church of *England*, and to give Occasion, and Advantage to the Popish Missioners of perverting our People, *which does not seem (saith he) to signify, they have any great Concern for the Church of England.*

This absurd, impertinent, and ill-natur'd Reflexion almost provokes me to ask our Reverend Adversary, how the *Supervisor* of his Book and he have studied, and where they were bred? As for the former I know he was bred in the University at a time, when neither true human, nor divine Learning was taught, or flourish'd there. Then there were neither Church, nor Priest, nor Altar, nor Sacrifice in the Place, but among a few of the faithful Remnant, who worshipp'd God in private. *Bishop* and *Priest*, and *Altar*, and *Sacrifice* were then Terms of Abomination there, when Students of Divinity began with *Wolfebius*, and proceeded no higher than to *Calvin*, and such Writers; and though it might be easy at the Restauration for some Men so educated, yet it was more difficult for others to get free of the Errors, and Prejudices with which they were first seasoned, and from this unhappy Time and sort of Education, and preposterous Method of Study, in which the

Doct^r glories, it hath proceeded in a great measure, that we have, and have had so many among the Clergy, that were never perfect, upright, and orthodox in some Doctrines, especially in those relating to the Constitution, Priesthood, and Service of the Christian Church. But doth not the Doct^r know, that the Notion of the Christian *Sacrifice*, or Oblation to which he hath such an Averſion, was always not only in the Books, but in the Offices of the Holy Eucharist before the Reformation? I will but present him with one out of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, Lib. VIII. cap. xii. and leave it to his Consideration. In this Chapter among the Directions for administering this Sacrament, we read that the *Catechumens* and *Audients*, &c. having gone out of the Church, the Deacon began the Office of the Holy Eucharist with that general Admonition, Μὴ τις κατὰ τινος. Μὴ τις ἐν ὑποκρίσει, *Let none that is not in Charity, let no Hypocrite come hither.* After pronouncing these Admonitions, he said: ὁδοὶ πρὸς κύριον μετὰ φόβου, καὶ τρέμου ἵσῳτες ὡμῶν προσφέρειν, *in Sincerity towards our Lord, let us standing offer with fear, and trembling.* Which being done (saith the Rubrick, for so I call the Direction) Οἱ Διάκονοι προσάγεται τὰ Δῶρα πρὸς ἐπισκόπον πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον, *Let the Deacons bring the Offerings unto the Altar to the Bishop.* Then the Bishop standing in his Priestly Robes before the Altar began the Sacramental Office with this Blessing: *The Grace of Almighty God, and the Love of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Communication of the Holy Spirit be with you all.* To which the People answered, *and with thy Spirit.* Then the Bishop: *Lift up your Hearts,* to which the People, *we lift them up unto the Lord.* Then the Bishop: *Let us give Thanks unto our Lord.* To

* Σταθὺς πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον.

which the People, "Ἀξιον, κ' Δίκαιον, it is meet, and right, &c. Then the Bishop: *It is truly meet and right, &c.* And then after a long and noble Hymn of Praise and Glory to God the Father, and the Son, in which is the Hymn *Ter Sanctus*, he proceeds to the Consecration, the most special part of the *Sacri-ficial Action*, in which after reciting the Words of the *Institution*, he saith in a Prayer of Oblation: Μεινεμύροι τοίνον τῷ πάτρι αὐτῷ, κ' τῷ θαλάτῃ, κ' τῷ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάσιως, κ' τῷ εἰς ἔραν ἐπανόσῃ, κ' τῷ μετὰ τῆς αὐτῆς δούτερας παρουσίας, ἐν ᾗ ἐρχέῃ μετ' ὁδοῦ κ' δυνάμειος κρῖναι ζώντας κ' νεκροὺς, κ' ὑποδύσασθαι ἑκάστῳ κ' τὰ ἔργα αὐτῷ, ΠΡΟΣΦΕΡΟΜΕΝ (οἱ τῷ βασιλεῖ κ' Θεῷ, κ' τῷ αὐτῷ διάταξιν, τ' ΑΡΤΟΝ τῆτον, κ' τὸ ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ τῷτο, εὐχαριστήεις (οἱ δὲ αὐτῷ, ἐφ' οἷς κατηξίωσας ἡμᾶς ἐσθῆναι ἐνώπιόν σου, κ' ΙΕΡΑΤΕΤΕΙΝ (οἱ, κ' ἀξιῶμεν (εἰ, ὅπως ἐμμελῶς ἐπιβλέψῃς ἐπὶ τὰ ΠΡΟΚΕΙΜΕΝΑ ΔΩΡΑ ταῦτα ἐνώπιόν σου, (ὅ ὁ ἀνεσθίης Θεός, κ' ἐυδοκήσῃς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς εἰς τιμὴν τῆς χρεῖς σου, κ' καὶ ἀπεμψῇς τὸ ἅγιον σου πνεῦμα ἐπὶ τῷ ΘΥΣΙΑΝ ταύτῃ, τ' μάρτυρα τ' παθημάτων τῶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, ὅπως ὁπορήνῃ τ' ΑΡΤΟΝ τῆτον ΣΩΜΑ τῆς χρεῖς σου, κ' τὸ ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ τῆτο Αἷμα τῆς χρεῖς σου, ἵνα οἱ μετὰ τῶν ἁγίων αὐτῷ, βεβαιωθῶσι πρὸς ἐυσέβειαν, ἀφίσεως ἀμαρτημάτων τύχωσι, τῷ ὁλοκαύστῳ κ' τῷ πλάτῃ αὐτῷ ρυθῶσι, πνεύματι ἁγίῳ πληρωθῶσι, ἀξιοὶ τῆς χρεῖς σου (εἰ γὰρ ἡμῶν), ζωῆς αἰώνις τύχωσι, (εἰ καὶ ὁλοκαύστῳ αὐτοῖς, δέσποτα παντοκράτορ, ἐτι δέδομεθα (εἰ, κύριε, κ' ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀγίας (εἰ Ἐκ-

* S. Cyrill. Catech. Myst. cap. x. Ἔπειτα μετ' τὸ ἐπαρτιδῆναι τὸ πνευματικὸν Θυσίαν, τ' ἀναίμακτον λατρείαν ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ ἐκείνῃ τῷ ἱλασμῷ, &c.

* Ibid. Μετὰ ταῦτα λέγει ὁ ἱερεὺς ΤΑ ΑΓΙΑ τοῖς ἀγίοις, Ἄγα τὰ προσκείμενα ἐπιφοιτήσιν δεξιὰ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι.

* Ibid. Ὁ δὲ ἀρχιερεὺς τὸ φιλάνθρωπον Θεὸν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα κατόπισται πρὸς τὰ προσκείμενα, ἵνα ποιήσῃ τ' ἡμεῖς ἅγιον, Σώμα χρεῖς σου. * τ' οἶνον, αἷμα χρεῖς σου.

ἀληθείας τὸ δὲ πρὸς περὶ τῶν, ἕως περὶ τῶν ὁρμητοῦν τῶν τι-
 μῶν ΑΙΜΑΤΙ τῶ χειρὸς (ε, ὅπως αὐτῶν ὁραφιδάξης ἀσσε-
 ρον κ' ἀκλυδώνισον, ἀχει τὸ (μῆλ) ἡείας τῶ αἰών. κ'
 ὑπὲρ πάσης ἐπισκοπῆς τὸ ὁρμητοῦν τὸ λόγον τὸ ἀλη-
 θείας. ἐτι ὁραφιδάξης (ε, κ' ὑπὲρ τὸ ἐμῆς τῶ ΠΡΟΣ-
 ΦΕΡΟΝΤΟΣ (οἱ ἐδένιας, κ' ὑπὲρ πάντος τῶ πρεσβυ-
 τερῶν, ὑπὲρ τὸ Διακόνων κ' πάντος τῶ κλήρου, ἵνα
 πάντας (οφίσας, πνύμαλ. ἀγίς πληρώσης. ἐτι ὁρα-
 φιδάξης (ε, Κύριε, ὑπὲρ τῶ βασιλείας, &c. ' Where-
 fore remembring his Passion, and Death, and Re-
 surrection from the Dead, and his Return (*Ascen-*
sion) into Heaven, and his Second Appearance, in
 which he will come in Glory, and Power to judge
 the Living and the Dead, and to reward every one
 according to their Works: We offer this Bread,
 and this Cup to Thee (*our*) King, and God ac-
 cording to his Institution; giving Thanks to Thee
 through him, who hast thought us worthy to stand
 in thy Presence, and execute the Priest's Office to
 Thee; and we beseech Thee, that thou wouldest
 look with Complacency on these Offerings lying
 before Thee, O God, who standest in need of
 nothing, and that thou wouldest accept them for
 the Honour of thy Christ, and send thy Holy Spi-
 rit, the Witness of the Sufferings of our Lord
 Jesus Christ upon this Sacrifice, that He may
 shew forth this Bread to be the Body of thy
 Christ, and this Cup to be thy Christ's Blood, that
 the Partakers thereof may be confirmed in Godli-
 ness; obtain the Remission of their Sins; be deli-
 vered from the Devil, and his Wiles; be filled
 with the Holy Ghost; made worthy of thy Christ;

Tert. *Sacrificamus* pro salute Imperatoris sed Deo nostro
 & ipsius.

Heb. ix. 14. *How much more shall the Blood of Christ, who
 through the eternal Spirit offered up himself, &c.*

Alias that it, if understood of the Sacrifice.

(and)

' (and) obtain eternal Life, Thou, O Lord Almighty
 ' being reconciled to them. Farthermore we
 ' pray unto Thee for thy Holy Church dispersed
 ' from one End of the World to the other, which
 ' thou hast purchased with the precious Blood of thy
 ' Christ, that thou wouldest preserve it unshaken,
 ' and unmolested unto the End of the World. (*We*
 ' pray) likewise for the whole Episcopat rightly di-
 ' viding the Word of Truth. We pray also for my
 ' worthless self, who am making this *Oblation*, and for
 ' all the Presbyters, for the Deacons, and the Cler-
 ' gy, that Thou wouldest instruct them, and fill
 ' them with the Holy Spirit. Farthermore, O
 ' Lord, we call upon Thee for the Emperor, &c.

This is as plain a Description of a Sacrifice, and
 a Sacrificial Action, as is in any Author Sacred, or
 Profane; and, *mutatis mutandis*, may be said of any
 Sacrifice offered upon any Altar, or to any God.
 At least it is so far from being *obscure*, *intricate*,
 and *perplex'd*, that it is plain, and easy to be under-
 stood, as indeed it generally is, wheresoever it is
 mentioned by the ancient Fathers, and Councils.
 But in later Ages, particularly in and after the second
 Council of *Nice*, the Notion of the Christian Sacri-
 fice began to be *perverted*, as I intend to shew in
 my Reply, and was still perverted, and perplexed
 more and more by the Writers for the Corporal
 Presence, who made the plain meaning of the Fa-
 thers, as well, as of the Scriptures intricate, and
 perplex'd. This is what Mr. *Mede* observes, who
 doth not, as the Doctor falsely saith, represent the
 meaning of the Fathers obscure, and intricate in it
 self, but that it was made so by the *Violence of Con-*
troversies, and changing the Notion of it in follow-
 ing Times, as Mr. *Thorndyke* also observes of the
 Popish Writers, who to maintain the Abuses of the
 Church of Rome, have disguised the true Intentions,
 and Expressions of the Catholick Church relating to the
 (the)

the Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist, which the Doctor not only by perverting the meaning of Mr. *Mede* in above ten Places of his *Answer*; but by other Arts, and Fallacies hath endeavoured to perplex to the best of his Skill, as much as any *Image-Worshipper*, or Defender of the Corporal Presence ever did from the beginning of that Controversy to this present time. The Doctor saith, he is *pretty sure it is not to be found in the Scriptures, no not in the 13th of the Hebrews, where Dr. Hickes pretends to find it.* But the Doctor throughout his *Answer* speaks like a Man of more than ordinary Assurance; and as for *Heb. xiii. 10.* he hath found by this time, that Mr. *Thorndyke*, Bishop *Beverege*, Dr. *Potter*, and others have pretended to find it there, as well as Dr. *Hickes*.

But to proceed to make Observations on the *Eucharistical Office* in the *Apost. Const.* we find the Bishop in the 13th Chapter saying: *Let us also pray unto God through his Christ for the * Offering, which hath been offered to the Lord God, that our merciful God through the Mediation of his Christ would receive it up unto his Holy Heavenly Altar for a sweet smelling Savour.* In the same Chapter, the Rubrick calls the consecrated Bread to be distributed ¹ *the Offering.* Answerably to all which in the 56th Chapter of the second Book, where in a short Account of the manner of administering the Holy Sacrament, the Administration of it is called *the Oblation of the Eucharist* ^m. *Let some of the Deacons attend to the Oblation of the Eucharist, ministering to the Body of the Lord with Fear, and let others look after the Congregation, and enjoin them Silence. Then let the Deacon, who assists the*

* Ὑπὲρ τοῦ Δώρου τοῦ προσκομιθέντος.

¹ Καὶ ὁ μὲν ἐπίσκοπος διδάσκει τὴν προσφορὰν.

^m Οἱ μὲν τῇ προσφορᾷ τὴν εὐχαριστίαν ὁλοκαίτω.

Bishop say, Let none come here, who hath injured another, let no Hypocrite come hither. Then let the Men mutually salute the Men, and the Women the Women with the Holy Kifs. But let none salute another treacherously as Judas did, who betray'd our Lord with a Kifs. After this let the Deacon pray for the Universal Church, &c. Then let the Bishop having given the Peace of God to the People, bless them as Moses commanded the Priests — and praying say: The Lord bless thee, and keep thee — After this let ^a the Sacrifice be done (offered) All the People standing, and praying in silence; and when it ^o is offered up, let every Order by it self orderly partake of the Lord's Body, and precious Blood with Reverence, and Fear.

This Account of the Eucharistical Service is also most agreeable to the Accounts we have of it, and of the Administration thereof both in the first Apology of *Justin Martyr*, and also to the Doctrine of it in his Dialogue with *Trypho*, and I do not doubt but it is most conformable to the Primitive, and Apostolical Form. And now let any candid Reader judge whether the *Bread, and Wine* are not the [ΔΩΠΑ] the Offerings in a proper literal Sense, which were brought by the Deacons to the Altar unto the Bishop, that he might dedicate them to be spent in the Service of the Holy Eucharist; The [ΤΙΠΩΚΕΙΜΕΝΑ ΔΩΠΑ] the proper material Offerings, that lay upon the Altar, and upon which the Bishop prayed God to look down in Mercy; The Offerings, of which the ^p Bishop, or Priest only was the Offerer; the Offerings which he took in his Hands, and offered in ^q the Name of the People; the Offerings of which God has no need; the Offerings, or the

^a Μετὰ τὰ ταῦτα Ἀκούσθαι ἡ Ἀσίσ. ^o Καὶ ὅταν ἀνέλχῃ.

^p Ὅτι ἐμὴς τὸ ΠΡΟΣΘΕΡΟΛΤΟΣ ἰδενίας.

^q Περὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ Κοι.

[ΘΥΣΙΑΝ] *Sacrifice*, upon which he prays God to send down his Holy Spirit, that it might shew forth the Bread to be the Body, and the Cup the Blood to the Receivers: Lastly, *the Offerings* of which, the Oblation or Consecration was called the *Sacrifice*, and of which they said in the ancient Offices, *Sancta Sanctis*, and *Tibi ex tuis offerimus*. And if all this be true, then let the Reader also judge, whether the Celebration of the Holy Eucharist was not a *Sacrificial Action*, or Administration, and the *Bread*, and *Wine* the *Matter* of that Sacrifice, which was first dedicated, and then by solemn Consecration offered up unto God, and last of all distributed to the Faithful for the Favour of God; the Remission of their Sins; the Benefit both of their Bodies and Souls; the Confirmation, and Encrease of their Faith; and preserving of them in all Godliness, and unto the Life of the World to come. In a word it is evident, that according to the ancient Church the *Bread* and *Wine* were the Matter which the People offered, and the Bishop received to be spent in the Celebration of the Eucharist; *the Matter*, which the Bishop solemnly offer'd up unto God by Consecration for the heavenly Banquet of the Lord's Supper, and which as they were in the literal Sense a proper external, material Offering, or Sacrifice which succeeded in the place of the legal Sacrifices: So in the *Sacramental*, or *Mystical*, they were the Body, and Blood of Christ, of which they were the Representatives, and whereof the one was broken with Wounds, and the other shed upon the Cross. In this Sense, I mean in the *Mystery* or *Sacrament*, though they are a *real*, yet they are but an *Antitypal* or *Symbolical* Sacrifice, and not that one *proper* Sacrifice, which Christ offered upon the Cross; of which they are, and of old were ever taught to be *only*

a representative, commemorative Sacrifice, and not the represented Sacrifice, but in a figurative Sense, just as the thing, which commemorates, is said to be the thing commemorated; the Representative the represented, or the Sign the thing signified, according to that in *Constit. Apost.* Lib. VII. Cap. xxv. Ἐπὶ ἀχαιοῦσιν, &c. *Adhuc gratias agimus, Pater noster, pro precioso sanguine Jesu Christi effuso pro nostri causa, & pro pretioso corpore, cujus & hæc Antitypa celebramus, cum ipse nobis constituerit mortem illius annunciare: per ipsum tibi Gloria in sæcula. AMEN.*

In short this *Notion*, as the Doctor calls the Catholick Doctrine of the Christian Sacrifice, is in all the *Eucharistical Offices* of the ancient Churches as if God gives Life, and Health shall be shew'd. It is that in which they all agree (though otherwise different) as in the Deacons bringing the Elements to the Bishop or Priest to be set upon the Altar; in the *Sursum Corda*; the Holy Kiss; the Prayer for the Holy Spirit, the loud, devout, and harmonious *Amen* by all the Faithful at the end of the Consecration; and the *Most holy*, otherwise called the *Victorious* and *Cherubin Hymns*, and in all probability among so many other differences, which the Succession of Time, and Bishops made, is the same in all those Offices must be Primitive, and Apostolical, according to the old Rule, that what was always taught, or practised in the Church, and of which no later Original can be found, must in all appearance be derived from the Apostles. Certainly what was practised in all Churches every where, and always " must be truly Catho-

* Ἀλλήλους ἀποδομεθα φιλήμασι, &c. *Inst. Mart. Apol.* i. p. 97.

* Τεταράσι, ἐννίκισι χειρικὸς ὕμνος.

* Vincent. Lirin. Cap. iii. Magnopere curandum est, ut id teneamus, quod ab omnibus, quod ubique, quod semper creditum est. Hoc est enim vere proprieque Catholicum. Cap. xxxix. Quicquid vel omnes, vel plures, uno eodemque sensu manifeste,

Catholick, though not *expressed* in the Scriptures. But Dr. *Hancock* in his Answer again, and again demands *express*, and *plain* Scripture to prove the Holy Eucharist to be a Sacrifice. Thus * *St. Basil* observes that the Enemies of the Holy Spirit called for Scripture-Demonstration of his Divinity, rejecting and despising the Authority of the Fathers, and faith it * was the common aim of all the Adversaries of sound Doctrine, that they might shake the Foundation of the Christian Faith, to beat down Apostolical Tradition to the ground. Doth not the *Doctor* know that the *Unitarians* of all sorts, together with *Presbyterians*, and *Antipædobaptists* do the same? They all call as he doth for express Scripture, and Scripture-demonstration in behalf of the Deity of the Second and Third Persons in the Holy Trinity, and *Episcopacy*, and for *Infant-Baptism*, which I now only suggest to him, beseeching him to consider how many received Christian Doctrines must be given up, if none are to be kept, but what are *plainly*, *expressly*, and *by name* delivered in the Scriptures. Doth not the Doctor know that of Divine Doctrines, or Revelations some are *clearly named* in the Scriptures, and some *only inferred* from them: the former of which are said to be *expressly*, and the other implicitly, and virtually in the

frequenter, perseveranter, velut quodam consentiente sibi magistrorum concilio, accipiendo, tenendo, tradendo firmaverint id pro indubitato certoque habeatur. cap. xli. Quicquid uno sensu, atque consensu tenuisse invenirentur, id Ecclesiæ verum, & Catholicum absque ullo scrupulo judicaretur. Tertull. de Corona, Cap. iii. iv. Basil. de Spiritu Sancto Cap. xxvii. xxix.

* Ibid. Cap. x. Τὰς ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν ἀποδείξεις ἐπιβόων, τὸ ἄγχαρον τῶν πατέρων μαρτυρίαν ὡς ἰδενὸς ἀξίαν ἀποπεμπόμενοι.

* Ibid. Κοινὸς σκοπὸς ἅπασι τοῖς ἐκκλησίαις, καὶ ἐκθεστὴς τῆς ὑγιαίνουσας διδασκαλίας, τὸ σκοπεῖν τὸ εἰς χεῖρον πίστεως καταστῆσαι ἐκ τῶν τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς παραδόσεως ἐδαρισθεῖς ἀφανισθῆναι.

Holy Codes, and for these more especially we have this Rule: *to make it our first and principal Care to interpret the Scripture according to the Sense of the Universal Church, and the Rule of the Catholick Faith, and herein to follow the Antiquity, Universality, and Consent of the Catholick, Apostolick Church.* But lest the Doctor after his scorning manner should here despise me, and my Fathers in the Margin, I desire him to consult Bishop BEVEREGE's *Proemium* to his *Codex Canonum Ecclesie Primitivæ*, §. 11. out of which I shall only transcribe these Words: *Sed nobiscum potius recolamus, quid universa Ecclesia, vel maxima saltem pars Christianorum de istis senserint, & in eâ acquiescamus sententia, in quam Christiani per omnia secula consenserunt. Quemadmodum enim omni in re consensus vox naturæ est, ut ait Cicero: sic etiam in hujusmodi rebus Consensus omnium Christianorum vox Evangelii meritò habeatur. Multa autem sunt, quæ licet in sacris Scriptis expresse, ac definitè non legantur, communi tamen omnium Christianorum consensione ex iis eruuntur. Exempli gratia, Tres esse distinctas in SS. Trinitate Personas, &c. Hæc & similia quamvis totidem verbis nec in veteri, nec in novo instrumento tradantur, de iis tamen in utroque fundatis inter omnes semper convenit Christianos, &c. Sic etiam infantes sacro baptismo, &c. Hæc & alia hujusmodi nusquam in SS. Scripturis diserte, ac nominatim præcipiuntur, sed nihilominus per MCCCC Annos, &c. Adeo ut quasi Communes sint Notiones omnium ab origine Christianorum, &c. Alioquin vero impossibile prorsus esset, ut tam unanimi con-*

⁊ Vincent. Lirin. Hoc scilicet facere magnopere curabunt — ut Divinum Canonem secundum universalis Ecclesie traditiones, & juxta Catholici Dogmatis Regulas interpretentur. In qua item Catholicæ Apostolicæque Ecclesie sequantur necesse est, Universalitatem, Antiquitatem consensionem, &c.

sensione,

ensione, ubique, & semper, & ab omnibus recipiuntur.

All this may very well be applied to the Doctrine of the Christian Sacrifice in the literal Sense; as the consentient Doctrine of the ancient Church throughout the World, which the ² Apostolick Canons, and the Fathers who met in the ³ Council in *Trullo* distinguished from all other external Altar-Offerings of Christians by the name of ^b SACRIFICE, because it was offered, and received *for the Remission of Sins*, and therefore forbid first Fruits to be joined with it in the Oblation, or distributed with it to the People, according to a corrupt Custom crept into the Church.

I believe the *Doctor* will scarce deny things offered to be a proper material Sacrifice, and the Oblation of them to a proper *Sacrificing* in their Sense, who believed them to be *offered*, and received ^c for the *Remission of Sins*, according to the common *Idea* of all Nations *Gentile, Jewish, or Christian*, who believed those Altar-Offerings to be proper Sacrifices, by which they thought their offended Deities propitiated, and reconciled to them. And if Offerings for the Propitiation, and Remission of Sins, and other divine Favours, and Benefits be not such a Sacrifice, I despair of ever knowing what a Sacrifice is. Let us see what ^d *Brissonus* saith to this purpose out of profane Authors.

Quacunque autem Deorum placandorum Causa A-
ris inferebantur, ea DONA appellabant. Nonius:
DONA consuetudine hæc habentur, quæ aut propi-

² Cap. iii.

³ Can. xxviii.

^b ΘΥΣΙΑ.

^c But no otherwise for the Remission of Sins, than the mystical washing in Baptism is, and the typical Sacrifices of the *Jews* were in virtue of that full, perfect, and sufficient Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross, which they prefigured, as *to come*, but the Eucharist represents as *past*.

^d Lib. I. de *Formulis*, p. 34. of the *Paris Edition* in Fol. 1583.

tiandis Diis dantur, aut hominibus pro Benefactis redduntur. *CIC. Lib. II. de Legibus.* Impius ne Audeto placare DONIS iram Deorum. *Et rursus ibidem:* DONIS impii ne Audeant placare Deos. *Plaut. in prologo Rudentis:* Jovem se placare DONIS, hostiis. *Virg. Lib. II. Æneid.* DONA ferunt, onerantque Aras, mactantque Juvenco, & *Lib. VII.* Hæc DONA Sacerdos contulit. — *Eademque* & MUNERA vocabant. *Arnob. Lib. VII.* Diis hostias & Cætera impendimus munera. *Virg. Lib. III. Georg.* Tu MUNERA supplex tende, petens pacem, with much more to this purpose. To which I may add that of * *Suidas* in ΘΥΣΙΑ. ἢ Θουσιῶν, &c. *Sacrificiorum alia sunt δωρεοποιχὰ, cum donum aliquod Deo offerimus. Alia ἀπολυτρωτικὰ, quæ ob liberationem à malo aliquo Deo offeruntur. Alia ἀλλοδαμικὰ, per quæ Deum placamus. Alia ἀποπληστικὰ, per quæ votum Deo persolvimus.*

I might add to this that *προσφορὰν*, and *Offerre* in the *Greek*, and *Latin Churches* were used by way of Eminence to signify the Celebration of the Eucharist, or Administration of the Lord's Supper, because the *Bread*, and *Wine* were first solemnly offered, and presented to God the Father, and then consecrated for the Use of the Holy Sacramental Banquet, with which the Faithful assembled were to be entertained. For the same Reason *προσφορὰ*, and *Oblatio*, as dangerous Words as they now are in the Apprehension of Dr. *Hancock*, in the Fathers, and Councils denote the Holy Communion, as I shall shew in another place at large, because it would take up too much room here.

From what I have just now cited out of MY FATHERS, *Tertullian*, *Basil*, and *Vincentius*, and from their elder Son, and my elder Brother, Bishop *Beverege*, and from my References to them, I must beg leave of the Doctor to make some Remarks relating to the Con-

troverſy between us. As *firſt*, ſuppoſing the *Doctrine of the Chriſtian Sacrifice in the Eucharift* to have no ground in the Scripture, as he contends, yet conſidering it hath the conſentient Teſtimony of Antiquity, may it not be ſafely admitted upon the account of *Apoſtolical Tradition*, as well as the innocent Doctrines, and Practices they inſtance in, which though they were not found in the Scriptures, nor founded in them, yet were not contrary thereunto. ' Such as theſe were the univerſal Practice of *ſigning with the Sign of the Croſs*; *worſhipping towards the Eaſt*; *the Words of Invocation to the Father for the Deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt at the Oblation of the Bread, and Wine in the Eucharift*; *the bleſſing of the Water*; *the white Robe*; *the Trine Immersion*; *Sponſors, and the Renunciation of the Devil in Baptiſm*; *and the baptized Perſons Preguſtation of Milk, and Honey*; *counting it unlawful to faſt on the Lord's Day*; and ſome others, *as the anniversary Celebration of the Day of our Lord's Paſſion, Reſurrection, and his Aſcenſion into Heaven*. Why then may not the Doctrine, and Practice of the *Chriſtian Sacrifice*, which is ſupported by the Catholick Tradition of all Churches, in all Times, and in all Places for fifteen hundred Years, be allowed the ſame Plea and Privilege, though we ſhould grant it had no Foundation in Holy Writ, *Secondly*, Suppoſing there is no *exprefs* Scripture for it, as the *Doctör* in vain attempts to prove, yet are not ^a 1 Cor. x. 20, 21. and ^b Hebr. xiii. 10. good Grounds for the Belief of it, and with the Comment of univerſal Tradition, as good Proofs thereof as any he can ſhew

^a *Baſil. de Spiritu Sancto, Cap. xxviii. Tertull. de Corona militis, Cap. iii, iv.*

^b *But I ſay the things which the Gentiles ſacrifice — Ye cannot drink the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils, &c.*

^c *We have an Altar, whereof they have no right to eat, &c.*

for *Infant-Baptism*, the *Observation of the Lord's Day*, the *annual Observation of Pentecost*, or for *Episcopacy it self*. If we had no other, I think these might pass for sufficient Arguments to prove the *Eucharistical Sacrifice*: But in the third place I can produce an express Authority, I mean the Words of our Lord, *Matth. xi. 23, 24. If thou bring thy Gift before the Altar — leave thy Gift before the Altar — and then come, and offer thy Gift.* The Doctor hath already been told by learned Men that Gift is here put for *Sacrifice*, in the Sense wherein the Jews, and our Lord used it, that is for a proper material Sacrifice; and that this was a new Evangelical Precept, like many others in the same Sermon, and that it related to the *Oblation* of the *New Testament* is plain from the *Fathers*, I'll say no more *My Fathers*, who understood, and applied it in that Sense. But this being to be shewn in another place, I shall now only pray my *Adversary* to consider how many of our own most learned Divines have taken this Text in the same Sense for the *Eucharistical Altar*, and *Offerings*, which were to succeed instead of those under the Law. Our Saviour indeed gave this Precept to *Jews*, but not as to *Jews*, but as to *Jews*, who were his Disciples, and to be trained up by him into *Christians*, and who when he was taken from them were to remember the new Doctrines, and Precepts he had taught them in the short time he conversed with them, among which this of Charity, and making Satisfaction for Injuries before we came to the *Altar*, was one. The *Μή τις κατὰ τὴν* ☩, and the *Holy Kiss of Peace* were in ancient Times founded upon this Text, as requiring a new Qualification for the Sacrifice of the *Holy Eucharist*, according to that of St. Cyrill. *Cat. Myst. Cap. v. Ἐἵτα βοᾷ ὁ διάκονος* ☩, ἀλλήλοις ἑαυτοῦ λαβετε, καὶ ἀλλήλους ἀπαζώμεθα, &c. Then the Deacon calls aloud, Embrace one another, and let us kiss one

one another. But do not think this Kiss to be like to those, which are commonly us'd in other Salutations, for it is not such. But this Kiss reconciles Souls, and is a Pledge of Amnesty, and Forgiveness: A Sign that there is commixture of Souls, and a perfect obliteration of all Injuries. And for this reason it was that Christ said: If thou bringest thy Gift unto the Altar, &c. Wherefore this Kiss is reconciliatory, and therefore holy, as St. Paul said: Salute you one another with a holy Kiss. From hence, and other the like Authorities, which I could produce, it appears that the Ancients look'd upon the Bread, and Wine to be the Gifts, or Offerings of this Text in a Sense so literal and proper, that they prayed God to accept them, as he did the Offerings of *Abel*, *Noah*, *Abraham*, *Melchisedech*, &c. which would have been very odd, had they believed them not to be proper, but only improper, and metaphorical Gifts, that is, in truth, and reality no Gifts, or Offerings at all.

I would pray him also to consider what a Jargon the Prayer of Consecration above written would appear to be if the Gifts, and Sacrifice therein mentioned were not to be understood in as proper a Sense, as those at the Jewish Altars were, but in his metaphorical, and improper Sense. Was their meaning metaphorical when they said to God, *We offer this Bread, and this Cup to Thee; these Gifts here lying before Thee; these Gifts or Offerings, of which thou standest in no need*: If these Gifts were only metaphorical Gifts, and the whole Sacrificial Action only metaphorical, then no Rites, no Expressions can secure any Jewish, or Gentile Oblations from a metaphorical Sense. These things I leave with my Adversary, till another Opportunity; and were I disposed to be as petulant, and impertinent with him, as he hath been with me, I might challenge him in return to prove from Scripture that *the Lord's Supper is a Sacrament*, and to give me out of it one express Proof

for that. *Sacrament* is the Word of the Latin Church, for *Mystery*, which signifies *Sacrament* in Greek. But there is not one Place in the *Greek Testament*, where the *Lord's Supper* is by name called a *Mystery*, or where the Bread is expressly said to be the *Mystical Body*, or the Wine the *Mystical Blood* of Christ, or where his Body, and Blood is expressly said to be mystically present, or to be received in a *Mystery* therein, though in St. *Ignatius's* Epistle to the *Trallians* he calls the Eucharistical Bread, and Wine *Mysteries*, where he calls the Deacons the ¹ *Ministers of the Mysteries*, or *Sacraments*, of *Jesus Christ*. Here I believe the Doctor may be willing to grant that the Father speaks properly, but let him call the Communion-Table, upon which they offered, and consecrated the Sacramental Elements never so often an ALTAR, then he speaks metaphorically, and so though he may be a good Proof for the Eucharists being a *Sacrament*, yet for its being a *Sacrifice* his Authority is no Argument at all. Had I a mind to be troublesome, I might also challenge the Doctor to shew me any one Place of the New Testament, where *Mystery*, and by consequence *Sacrament*, may be inferred to be understood of the *Lord's Supper*. I know but one, which may be produced for this purpose, and that is 1 Cor. iv. 1. *Let a Man so account of us, as of the Ministers of*

¹ Δεῖ δὲ τοὺς Διακόνους ὄντας ΜΥΣΤΗΡΙΩΝ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Voss. in locum. Dicit enim non debere esse quenquam, cui non placeant omnibus modis Diaconi. Illos enim non esse Esculentorum, & poculentorum, sed ministros mysteriorum Dei sive Sacramentorum. I must farther observe; that by *Mysteries*, or *Sacraments* in this Place are to be understood the *Sacramental Bread*, and *Wine*, which are commonly called by the Ancients, τὰ Μυστήρια, and τὰ Δείπα in the plural Number. And that by the *Mysteries of Jesus Christ* the *Bread*, and *Wine* are here to be understood is evident from the following *Antithesis*: οὐδὲ βρωμάτων, οὐδὲ ποτῶν εἰσὶν Διάκονοι, they are not *Ministers of* (common) *Meat and Drink*.

Christ, and Stewards of THE MYSTERIES of God. I wish with all my heart this Place could be interpreted of the *Two Sacraments*. But I do not remember one Expositor ancient, or modern, but who understands the Place of the *Mysteries of the Christian Faith*, and Doctrine, the *Arcana Evangelii*, which the Apostles discovered to the World.

Reflecting upon what I have now written, did I not consider the Power of Prejudice in Men, I should wonder, how *Sacrament* came to jostle *Sacrifice* not only out of so many Reformed Offices of the *Lord's Supper*, but out of the Writings of *Divines*, who have treated on that Subject, as if now we were to know the *Holy Institution* but by *halves*, which the ancient Apostolical Churches knew in *whole*, and so taught, and learn'd it, though we teach and learn but half of it, as the *Papists* administer and receive it, but in *one kind*. This perhaps was the pious Reason why Mr. *Nelson* endeavoured to retrieve this Primitive Word, and Notion, by bringing the one into the *Title-Page*, and the other into the *Devotions* of his Book. For he that knew *Id verum, quod prius*, might think he could not more honour God, or better serve his Church, or more benefit his Readers in writing on that Subject, than by restoring the *Sacrifice* to the *Sacrament*, which had kept Possession in the Churches of God for fifteen hundred Years, and was a Notion so proper to explain the special Nature of that Mystery, as also to enflame the Devotion of the Faithful, and increase their Veneration for the *Sacrament*, and the whole Ministration thereof.

Thus much I have said by the way in Answer to the Doctor's repeated Demands of Scripture proof for the Eucharist's being a proper *Sacrifice*: In the conclusion whereof he must allow me to say, that it shall always be a *Sacrifice*, and the Holy *Table*, upon which it is offered, and consecrated an *Altar* to me,

me, and that as long, as I can execute my *Priests* Office, I will administer the *one*, and serve at the *other* with all the Reverence that is due to them, as such. I think the *Notion* of the Sacrifice, as he calls it, and which I will now venture to call the *common Notion* of ancient Christianity, is a noble Notion most proper to excite Devotion, and agreeable to the Nature of the *Sacrament*, the great, and venerable *Mystery* of the Holy Eucharist, and if I should ever write a Book of it, as I think I now never shall, I would first treat of it as a *Sacrifice*, and then, as it is a *Sacrament*, and with all due Regard to many learned Men, who have written of the *Lord's Supper*, only as a *Sacrament*, I take the Freedom to say, that how useful, and excellent soever, their Books may otherwise be, yet excluding the Doctrine of the Sacrifice from their Subject, I think they are deficient and imperfect Works.

I have hitherto been shewing, that it is no Fault, but on the contrary what becomes a Christian Writer, to bring this *Primitive, common, and consentient* Doctrine of the Catholick Church into *Books of Devotion*, and but that I foresee it would swell my *Preface* beyond its Bounds, I should shew the same from the admirable Prayers in the ancient Offices, which relate to the *Lord's Supper*, as a *Sacrifice*. But this, I hope, may be done by another Hand. I shall therefore only proceed to shew, that the Notion of the Sacrifice in the Eucharist is no Stranger to the *Communion-Devotions* of the Church of *England*, for as it was in the first *Common Prayer-Book* of *Edward the VIth*: So is it now in her present *Liturgy*, though *Dr. Hancock* takes upon him to deny both. In the former the *Holy Table* is almost always called the *Altar* in the *Rubricks* of the *Communion*, and after the *Offertory*, the Minister is directed to take so much Bread, and Wine, as shall suffice, and set them both upon the Altar. Then after

after the Versicles, and proper Prefaces, he proceeds to pray for the whole State of Christ's Church, in which is this Petition: *And especially we commend unto thy merciful Goodness this Congregation, which is here assembled in thy Name to celebrate the Commemoration of the most glorious Death of thy Son.* Then he proceeds to the Prayer of Consecration, *Almighty God our Heavenly Father, who of thy tender Mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer Death — hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech Thee, and of thy Almighty Goodness vouchsafe so to bless with thy Word, and Holy Spirit these thy Gifts, and Creatures of Bread, and Wine that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy most dearly beloved Son, who in the same Night that he was betrayed took Bread —* and while the Minister rehearsed these Words, he still turned to the Altar, and then proceeded to the Memorial, or Prayer of Oblation as followeth: *Wherefore, O Lord, and Heavenly Father, according to the Institution of thy dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, we thy humble Servants do celebrate, and make here before thy Divine Majesty with these thy Holy Gifts, the Memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make, having in remembrance his blessed Passion, mighty Resurrection, and glorious Ascension — And we entirely desire thy Fatherly Goodness to accept this our Sacrifice of Praise, and Thanksgiving, humbly beseeching Thee to grant — And though we be unworthy through our manifold Sins to offer unto thee any Sacrifice, yet — Amen.* Here the Holy Gifts are presented to God upon the Altar. Then they are solemnly consecrated upon it by Prayer for the Celebration of the Eucharist, or the Lord's Supper: With respect to the former of which they are *Δωρεα*, *Dona*, and with respect to the latter *Sacrificia*, according to the received Distinction: *Dona sunt, quæ Deo donantur, Sacrificia, quæ*

quæ cum orationibus consecrantur. Otherwise *Dona*, & munera Deo offeruntur. Sacrificia, id est Sacra facta, *quæ prece mysticâ consecrantur.* Wherefore if a Sacramental, or mystical Prayer of Consecration will make Offerings a Sacrifice, the Bread and Wine in the Communion must be truly, and properly such, according to the common Notion that all Religions have of a Sacrifice, or Sacrificial Mystery of which the Offerers partake at the Tables of their placated, and atoned Gods. But the *Doctor* tells me that in the Communion Service of the first Book of King *Edward* the VIth there is no mention of a Prayer of Consecration, or Oblation. What then? Doth it follow from thence that the one is not a *Prayer of Consecration*, and the other of *Oblation*, because they are not so named? The Prayer preceding is a Prayer for the whole Estate of *Christ's Church*, but is not so called, though it is really such, and so named in the second Book of *Edw.* VI. and downwards to the *Scottish Office* for administering the Holy Communion, and the present Office of our Church. In like manner the *Prayer of Consecration* though not so called neither in the first Book of *Edward* the VIth, nor in any after till the Restoration, yet in reality it is such a Prayer, and is so called in our present Office, and so likewise the *Prayer of Oblation*, though it be not so named, yet in Truth and Strictness it is such, and so called in the *Scottish Office*, and by Mr. *Thorndike*, who in the 22^d Chapter of his *Just Weights, and Measures* speaks thus: *The proper Prefaces, and * Seraphim Hymn are of ancient, and general Use in the Catholick Church, not to be omitted without a mark of Apostacy from the Devotion of it, which they express. The Prayer with which we consecrate seemeth agreeable to the Intent of God's Church, but more agreeable is*

* Called before the *Victorious*, and *Ter-Sanctus* Hymn.

that Form, which the first Book of Edward the VIth revived by the Scottish Liturgy, prescribeth, and that Memorial, or Prayer of Oblation, which is there prescribed to follow immediately after the Prayer of Consecration, is certainly more proper there, than after the Communion: Ending with the Lord's Prayer, and the Peace after that. So in the Communion-Office of our present Liturgy, the old Rubrick for the Priest to set the Bread, and Wine upon the Holy Table is restored, and the Order of doing it is directed in this manner: *While the Sentences for the Offertory are reading the Deacons, Church-wardens, or other fit Person appointed for that purpose shall receive the Alms for the Poor, and other Devotions of the People in a decent Bason, and reverently bring it to the Priest, who shall humbly present and place it upon the Holy Table.* This is one sort of offering, which may be made when there is no Communion. But *when there is a Communion (saith the Rubrick) the Priest shall then place upon the Table so much Bread, and Wine as he shall think sufficient, which is the other Offering proper for the Communion, as being offered to be consecrated, and consumed in the Celebration thereof.* These two Offerings being set in order upon the Holy Table, the Priest is directed to say: *Almighty, and ever living God — we humbly beseech Thee most mercifully to accept our ALMS, and¹ OBLATIONS.* I have already observed the difference that is, and is accordingly made by the Church between these two material Offerings, whereof the one is given, and presented upon the Altar for pious, and charitable Uses, especially for the maintenance

¹ Note that in the Office for administering the Holy Communion in the second Book of Edward the VIth, and all succeeding Offices, till the old Rubrick in the Office of the Lord's Supper for setting the Bread, and Wine upon the Altar was restored in our present Liturgy: It only was *accept our Alms.*

of the Poor, but the other are dedicated, and offered for the Service of God in the Holy Eucharist, and to that end to be consecrated into a *Memorial* of the Sufferings, and Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross in remembrance of his Death, and Passion, and thereby become in the Mystery, or Sacrament the Body and Blood of Christ to the faithful Receivers. This Consecration of the OBLATIONS for the Use of God's Table, and to be made his Entertainment, is perform'd by *the Solemn Prayer*, and rehearsing the Words of the Institution, at which the Priest first takes the Patin into his Hands, and breaks the Bread, and then lays his Hand upon all the consecrated Bread, which by Consecration, as St. Ignatius calls it, becomes *the Bread of God*. Then in like manner he takes the Cup into his Hand, and lays his Hand upon every Vessel, in which there is Wine to be consecrated for the Heavenly Entertainment, and then receiving in both kinds himself, proceeds to deliver the same in order to the Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and the People, who are all entertained as Guests at the Lord's Table with the consecrated Oblations, and in partaking of them are made Partakers of the Body, and Blood of Christ, which they represent. In the Post Communion after the Lord's Prayer, the Priest desires God of his *Fatherly Goodness mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of Prayer, and Thanksgiving*; which hath the same signification it had before when it was in the Prayer of Oblation, out of which that Prayer is taken. I mean the same special, and I may say *Technical* Signification it hath in the ancient Eucharistical Offices, to denote the Sacrifice of the Bread, and Wine offered to be spent in that Divine Service. After this I need not say more in Defence of the Eucharistical Sacrifice of *Bread and Wine*, nor of Mr. Nelson, or any other Person

^a Called in the Rubrick the *Prayer of Consecration*.

for bringing the Notion thereof into Books of Devotion, as I find Bishop *Beverege* hath done in his Devotions at the end of his Treatise of *the Necessity, and Advantage of the Holy Communion*. Where after having declared the Holy Eucharist not to be ^a a propitiatory Sacrifice for the Living, and the Dead, but only a Sacrifice commemorative, and declarative of the Sacrifice, which Christ once offered upon the Cross, and ^o that it succeeded in the room of all the Jewish Types, and Representations of the Death of Christ, and is our Shew bread, our Burnt-offering, our Sin offering, our Trespas offering, our Thank-offering, our Meat offering, our Drink-offering, and all the Offerings required of us, whereby to commemorate our Lord, and what he hath done for us: I say after all this among the private Devotions there is ^p this Prayer: *Be pleased, O God, to accept this our bounden Duty, and Service, and command that the Prayers, and Supplications, together with the Remembrance of Christ's Passion, which we do now offer up unto Thee, may by the Ministry of thy Holy Angels be brought up into thy Heavenly Tabernacle, and that Thou not weighing our Merits, but looking upon the blessed Sacrifice of our Saviour which was once fully, and perfectly made for us all, mayst pardon our Offences, and replenish us with thy Grace, and Heavenly Benediction through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.* I must also take notice that the Bishop in these Devotions calls the Holy Table the Altar, as in these Inscriptions for his several Prayers: *Before going to the Altar; At going to the Altar; At prostrating before the Altar*, which I desire Dr. *Hancock* to observe, who hath no kindness for the Word *Altar*, nor for shewing Reverence

^a P. 112, 113. 3^d Edit. ^o P. 128. 132. According to that in *Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho*, P. 258, 259, 260.
^p P. 272.

at it, and therefore corrects me without Mercy for saying that the Priest was directed to set the Bread, and Wine with *Reverence* upon the Table, or Altar, observing, as he thinks to my great Confusion, that the Word *Reverence* is not in the rektored Rubrick, which I freely confesse. But the Reasons why I asserted, that Oblations were directed to be set with *Reverence* upon the Table are these: First, Because I could not imagine, but that it was the Church's Intention, that they were to be set as humbly and reverently upon the Table, as the Alms, and other Devotions, which she commands to be *reverently brought to the Priest, who shall humbly present, and place them upon the Table*; and Secondly, Because she ordains, that *when all have communicated, the Minister shall return to the Lord's Table, and reverently place upon it what remaineth of the consecrated Elements, covering the same with a fair linen Cloth*. I thought that seeing the Church commanded the remainders of the consecrated Elements to be placed *reverently* upon the Table at the end of the Service, I might presume it was her Intention that they should be as *reverently* set upon it at the beginning thereof, and for setting the Oblations upon the Holy Table according to the Church's Order, and setting them *reverently* upon it, that is with bowing, or kneeling, it is, that he is pleased, as he thinks with Justice, and Decency to reproach me again, and again as one, who loves pompous Worship.

The *Doctor* in the conclusion of his *Answer* tells me, ' *If I please to make any Reply, he shall not easily forsake me* : This I suppose was intended for a *Gasconade* to fright me from replying to him, which he sees I design to do. And in the mean time, he must allow me to say of both his Books, I mean of

his *Answer*, and his *Patres Vindicati*, as Dr. Heylin in his *Exam. Hist.* said of Dr. Hakewel's^r *Answer* to his *Antitodum Lincolnienſe*, which was written to prove the *Eucharist* to be a *Sacrifice*, that I find neither of them to be ſuch knotty Pieces, but that they may be cleſt aſunder without Wedge or Beetle. The Doctor alſo is pleaſed to ſay, that if he hath ſaid any thing in his *Answer* that may juſtly diſpleaſe me, he begs my Pardon. I leave others who have read his *Answer* to judge if he hath not ſaid enough of that kind from one end of it to the other, or if he hath written it with the Ingenuity of a Scholar; the Impartiality of a Juſt; the Modesty of a Sober; the Charity of a Chriſtian Writer; or laſtly with the Civility of a Gentleman, or the Gravity of a Divine. But in what I have here occaſionally written againſt him in Defence of the *Eucharistical Sacrifice*, I have avoided all perſonal Reflections, all high, petulant, and aſſuming Expreſſions, and whatſoever might juſtly offend; and it is my Satisfaction, that I have not ſaid any thing, for which I ought to aſk his Pardon, or when I go, to offer, or officiate at the *Altar*, be afraid of the awful Monition of ΜΗ ΤΙΣ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΙΝΟΣ, that ΕΚΑΣ ΕΣΤΕ of the Chriſtian Sacrifice, or fear that I ſhould not partake of it, εἰς (υψώσῃσιν πλῆμυθῆμάτων, εἰς (ωτηρίαν εἰς ἀφῆσιν ἀμαρτιῶν, εἰς ὠφέλειαν ψυχῆς, καὶ (ωμαίῳ, εἰς φυλακὴν εὐσεβείας, εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, εἰς βασιλείας ὑρανῶν κληρονομίαν, εἰς παρρησίαν τῷ πρὸς τὸ Θεόν, μὴ εἰς κρίμα, ἢ κατὰ κρίμα.

But beſides the Doctor, there is another Writer, the Author of a Book entituled, *A Vindication of the Church, and Clergy of England*, who hath done me

^r Entituled, *A Dissertation with Dr. Heylin, whether the Eucharist be a Sacrifice properly ſo termed, and that according to the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of England.*

^r Procul este profani.

the Honour to write against me by name for asserting the *Christian Priesthood*, and *Christian Sacrifice*, which, he saith, is one of the new Notions, that have been lately coined without the true Image of our Church upon them. I am so far from making any Answer to what he hath written against those Doctrines, and me for them, that I desire all learned Men, who have read my Discourse of the *Christian Priesthood*, to read, and consider what he hath said as an Adversary to so little purpose against me, from the 101st Page to the 108th Page of his despicable Piece. They will find, to use his own Words: That he looks like one of the little Folks set up to peck against me, and that he is to be cast off, as he saith Mr. Hoadly did the Reader of St——y with Indignation; and that I should do him too much Honour to return an Answer to him. Mr. Sharp, whom he means by the Reader of Stepney, doth as plainly as by name assure the World, that Dr. Kennet Dean of Peterborough is the Author of that Book, calling him Dr. K——t, and D. of P——, and the Dean, and Mr. Dean, and dear Mr. Dean, and honest Mr. Dean about forty times in his Defence, entituled *The would be Bishop*; and if the Doctor is indeed the Author of it, it was Prudence in him not to put his Name to it, which for its whole clumsy and rude Structure, and Composure, as well, as for the Materials of it, is utterly unsuitable to his Character (I must not say, as a *Christian Priest* but) as a *Christian Minister*, and unworthy of his great Name. I confess there are some remarkable *Fiocco's* in it that would make one suspect Mr. Dean to be the Author of it, but then there are other Passages therein, which one would hope were impossible for him to write. For my own part could I believe him to be the Author of it, I could then believe him to be the Author of the scandalous Histories of the later

Reigns in the *Historical Collections* which common Fame lays to his charge. But there are several special Reasons, why I cannot, why I would not easily believe him to be the Writer of it, besides the general Matters in it, and the manner in which he treats of them. It is difficult for me to believe, that so wise a Man should so contrary to his known Prudence, and specious Piety, write so many gross Untruths in it to defame Mr. Sharp, as he hath shew'd that Author hath done; or that he should call him " *Judas*, and " *Shimei*, and *the Son of Satan*, and treat him, as indeed that Author hath treated all Readers, and Curates, * and sometimes upon the account of their Poverty, with so unbecoming an Air of Insolence and Contempt. Could the Dean so forget himself, as to † write against the Hereditary Succession, and Passive Obedience in the manner, as that Author hath done; the Dean, I say, who wrote so high for both in his Preface to his Translation of *Pliny's Panegyrick to Trajan*, or be so imprudent as to declare himself ‡ no *Friend to Pluralities*, who is one of the greatest, if not the greatest *Pluralist* of his time? Besides this incoherent Writer, though he taxes me with coining § a *new Notion of the Christian Priesthood without the true Image of our Church upon it*, yet he aggravates the Address of Mr. Sharp to the Archbishop, and Bishops, and dignify'd Clergy, in that he being ¶ a *true, and real Priest of the Church of England*, should thereby expose the whole Function (i. e. the true, and real *Priestly Function*) and betray the Church to the Scorn of Unbelievers. Is it possible for so eminent a Man, as Dr. Kennet to write in this unthinking manner without common Prudence, or Reflection? Or to plead in that vile manner, as he hath done, for the corrupt, and ir-

* P. 4. * P. 84. * By the low, and little Men in Orders, such as &c. p. 100. * P. 85. &c.
 † P. 63. † P. 101. † P. 4.

regular Practices of the Clergy, in taking Money for visiting the Sick; in administering private Baptism by the publick Form; in Churching Women at home, &c. and in ridiculing the Observation of the Vigils, which the Church hath commanded to be observed? Could Dr. Kennet who drew up his Reasons, for which he could not for some time take the Oath, and found it so difficult to overcome his Scruples, so spitefully treat the Deprived, who with Interest on their Side, and all the Pains they took with themselves could not overcome theirs? Or could he, as this Pamphleteer hath done, call them JACOBITES with Mobish Scorn, and in Mobish Contempt of that very Prince JACOBUS II. who once was his admired, as well as his lawful Sovereign, and whom in his Preface to Pliny's Panegyrick he praised to such a degree, as few Panegyrist's ever magnified any Prince good, or bad, from whom they feared Punishment, or courted Preferment, or Reward? Could he so invidiously reflect upon Mr. Sharp for so often citing and commending Mr. Nelson's Book, as to suggest he did it, *because he admired him upon another account.* Certainly Mr. Sharp had all the Reason imaginable to mention that Gentleman, and his Book with all Respect, and to praise him, were there no other Reasons, for the sake of his excellent performance in it, which hath been already so well received in five several Editions, and will have many more. But Dr. Kennet is no Stranger to the singular Worth of that Gentleman, who spends his Time, and Estate in promoting the temporal, and spiritual Happiness of Men, and is a Member of the same Society with himself for propagating Christian Knowledge; and therefore it seems not credible that he could be so mean, and malicious, as to insult him upon that other account.

Farthermore could Dr. Kennet, who hath so great an Understanding, argue in that false, sophistical, and loose way of Reasoning, in justifying or excu-
sing

sing the *Irregularities* of the Clergy, and declaiming against the Doctrine of *Passive Obedience*, and of the *Christian Sacrifice*, as I could shew, if I could do it without swelling this Preface into a Book, that wretched Writer hath done. After these Reasons, whoever can imagine Dr. Kennet to be the Author of that Book, must think that Dr. Kennet is not Dr. Kennet, or what he pretended formerly to be; and as for my own part, I ought to be the last of Men, who can believe him to be the Writer of it, unless he hath learn'd to blow hot and cold, to contradict his Reverend Self, and profess one thing in private, and publish another to the World. For this Author hath written against my *Discourse of the Christian Priesthood*, and against the Doctrines of it, I mean the *Christian Priesthood*, and the *Christian Sacrifice*, as *new Notions*; which is my last Argument to prove that the Doctor is not likely to be the Man, because he not only highly commended the whole Work, of which that is one part, at its first Publication, to some of his Friends in Expressions not fit for me to recite: But also did me the Honour to write the following Letter of Approbation to me, which I recommend in particular to Dr. Hancock's Perusal, that he may see Dr. Kennet could not in probability be the Author of that Pamphlet, in which he is encouraged to write against me.

REVEREND SIR,

I Did not return from my Visitation before Monday Night, when I found your excellent Book, a kind Present to me. I have since read over the two Letters, and the Preface with great Satisfaction, and thank you heartily for the great, and seasonable Service you have done to the Christian Church, and Religion against the common Enemy of them. I will

come and return my Thanks in Person, as soon as my Business will admit. In the mean time I heartily pray for your Health, and Happiness,

Dear Sir,

Your Obligated Friend, and
Humble Servant,

Aldgate, May
28. 1707.

WH. KENNET.

I must tell Gentlemen, who never read my Book, that the first of the *two Letters* the Dean mentions in this Letter to me, is that of the *Christian Priesthood*, in which as well, as in the *Preface* he speaks of, I have asserted, and I think proved the Holy *Eucharist* to be a proper *Sacrifice*; and one would even hope against Hope, that he who then approved my Doctrine of the *Christian Priesthood and Sacrifice*, should not be so false, and inconsistent with himself as to condemn them for *new*, and by consequence, as strange Doctrines, and Innovations brought into the Church. But if after this it shall appear, that Mr. Dean did write the *Vindication of the Church, and Clergy of England*, he must be content to bear the Shame, and Reproach of it, and the Penance of his own Reflections; and let him assure himself, that what Reverence soever good, and learned Men may have for his Characters, they can have none for his Person, if they once come to know, or believe, that he is the Author of that Book. No Apologies will ever justify, or excuse him for writing of it; no present, or future Titles or Promotions can support the Credit of a *Divine*, who will not *abide in Honour*, but wilfully expose himself for what I will not name, and thereby dishonour

Two Treatises, one of the *Christian Priesthood*, the other of the Dignity of the *Episcopal Order*.

his

his venerable Characters as a *Dignitary*, a *Dollor*, and a *Priest*.

If Dr. Kennet, as I wish, be not the Author of that Book, the publishing of his Letter, which contains nothing, but what becomes his Character, and Profession, cannot hurt him, or cause the least Reflection upon him. But if indeed he is the Author of it, as Mr. Sharp tells the World he is, then he ought not to blame me, but himself, who hath obliged me to produce it, or a summary account of it in Evidence against him for my Vindication: And if he calls this, as perhaps he will, *betraying the Secrets of private Conversation*, let him remember, that he hath cancelled all the Obligations I had to keep it private, and broken the Laws of Honour and Friendship by first secretly writing not only in contradiction to himself, but with the Air of an Enemy against a Man, that never did him wrong.

There is also another Gentleman of Character, who hath honour'd me with a few Strictures, viz. Dr. John Edwards of Cambridge, in the *Third Part of his Preacher*. P. 10, 11. I refer the competent Reader to what * he hath said there, and leave him to judge between us, and shall make no other Answer to him, than to advise him seriously to reflect upon his evil Passions, those inward movements of his Pen, and to consider how much he is fallen below himself in his late Writings, and to what a degree he is unhappily sunk by publishing of them, in the Esteem of the learned World.

Before I conclude, I cannot but observe how dissingenuous those Writers are, who misrepresent this Doctrine of the *Eucharistical Sacrifice*, as dangerous, and as *such* endeavour to render it scandalous, and odious to the People, as if it were the ready way, and so intended by the Teachers of it, to in-

introduce the *Popish Sacrifice of the Mass*, and bring the Church back to it again. Those, who have read *Canterbury's Doom*, and the *Charge of the Scottish Commissioners*, will know very well, that I have just Cause to make this Reflection, and particular Reason to put my Adversaries in Remembrance of it. But this is a most uncharitable and unjust Charge, and where it is not the Effect of Ignorance, or insuperable Preconceptions, it is the pure Effect of Malice; For there is no more alliance between the ancient Doctrine of the *commemorative*, or *representative Sacrifice* of the *Bread, and Wine* in the Eucharist, and that of the *expiatory Sacrifice for the Quick, and Dead in the Mass*, than betwixt *Reward, and Merit*, or between the *Superiority* of one Bishop over many Presbyters, and the *Supremacy* of one chief Universal Pontif over all the Bishops of the Christian World. On the contrary it is so far from being true that there is any consequence of this from that, that of the two, *that* is a bar to *this*, and neither is nor can be any more the same Sacrifice, which Christ offered upon the Cross, than an Ambassador is the King he represents, or a Picture its Prototype, or the *Representation* of Things, and Persons, and Actions upon a Stage, the Things, and Persons, and Actions themselves. Wherefore the right understanding of the *commemorative*, and *representative Sacrifice* in the Eucharist is so far from reducing us to the *Sacrifice of the Mass*, that it secures us like a Bulwark against it, and it is as impossible for Men rightly instructed in it to misconceive, or mistake the one for the other, as it is for any *Donatory* to imagine the Deed of Gift is the Land which the *Donor* gave him, or for a Spectator of any *Dramatick Action* to think it the very History or *Reality*, which it represents. The Church then can receive no Damage, or Prejudice by this Doctrine, as some Men, and in particular my Adversaries

ries seem to fear : On the contrary it is a great Benefit, and Advantage to her to be thought so Primitive as to teach, and practise it. For it is one of the Objections which the Papists bring against us, that we have no Sacrifice, as may be observed from what I have before cited out of Archbishop Bramhal, and I expected it from the excellent Lady, to whom I wrote these controversial Letters. And I can assure my Adversaries from good Authority, that there is now a Person of great Quality in France, who is kept back by no other Cause from coming to the Church of England, but that he is told *She hath no Sacrifice* : To which his learned Correspondent here, who is one of the French Ministers, in Answer hath assured him, that the Bishops, and Clergy of the Church of England freely teach the Doctrine of the Eucharistical Sacrifice, as it was taught, and practised in the purest Ages of the Catholick Church, which, I may presume from the Gentleman's Objection he understands very well. If he hath but read one of the Ancients, I mean *Justin Martyr*, he cannot but know, *that the Eucharistical Bread, and Wine are the Sacrifices or Offerings of the convert Gentiles foretold by Malachi i. 2. that these Offerings succeeded in the room of all other Offerings, and that the Meat-Offering mingled with Oil for the cleansing of a Leper (Levit. xiv.) was a Type of the Eucharistical Bread which Jesus Christ our Lord commanded us to offer ; that these Offer-*

ἢ Πιστὶς ἢ ἐν παντὶ πότῳ ὑφ' ἡμῶν τῶν ἰθύνων προσφερόμενων αὐτῷ Θυσίων, τίς ἐστι τῆς ἀρετῆς τῆς εὐχαριστίας, δὴ τῆς πόσιναι, ὁμοίως τῆς εὐχαριστίας, περιέχει τότε ἑαυτὴν. Dial. cum Tryph. p. 260. Vid. etiam p. 344. Ἀρχιεπιστολικὸν τὸ, &c.

ἢ Δὴ ἡ τῆς Σεμιδάλεως προσφορά — ἢ ἡ τῆς καθεστῶ-
μένων ἀπὸ τῆς λέξεως προσφερόμεναι ὁμοδοθεῖσα, τύτῳ ἢ
τῆς ἀρετῆς τῆς εὐχαριστίας ὅν ἐστι ἀνάμνησις τῆς πάσης — Ἰησοῦς
Χριστός ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν παρέδωκε ΠΟΙΕΙΝ. Ibid. 259, 260.

inga

ings are ^h brought to the Bishop or Priest, which he receiving offers them to the Father of all Things, in the Name of his Son, and Holy Spirit, and then makes (or offers) large Thanksgiving to him for thinking us worthy of them, and when he hath ended the ⁱ Prayers, and Thanksgiving, all the People, who are present, with a loud Voice say Amen.

There are other Places in this Father's Dialogue with Trypho to the same purpose, as where applying the Prophecy of Isaiah xxxiii. 16, 17. he saith: ^h It is evident that this Prophecy is to be understood of the Bread, which our Christ appointed us to offer in remembrance of his Incarnation for those, who believe in him, and for whose sake he was made passible, and of the Cup, which he appointed those, who celebrated the Eucharist, to offer in remembrance of his Blood. So in another Place: ⁱ And as I said before Prayers being ended Bread and Wine mixed with Water, are offered, and the Bishop in like manner offers up Prayers, and Thanksgivings with all the Devotion he is able, and the People with an Acclamation say AMEN. To all these let me add: The Bishop having administered the Eucharist — the Ministers we call Deacons distribute to every one of the Communicants to partake of the Eucharistical Bread, and Wine mixed with Water, and then carry

^h Ἐπειτα προσφέρει τῷ προσώπῳ τῷ Ἀδ' ἡσὼν ἄρτον καὶ σίτημα ὕδατος, καὶ κραματόν, καὶ ὕττον λαβὼν, αἶνον δὲ δόξαν τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ὁλῶν διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ, καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου ἀναπέμψας καὶ εὐχαριστῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατηξιώσας τῶν παρ' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ πολὺ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΑΙ, &c.

ⁱ What those other Prayers were, which were offered with the Eucharistical Prayer of Thanks, may be seen in the Apost. Const. Lib. VIII. Cap. xii, xiii.

^h Ὅτι μὲν ἐν καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ προσέσεια φέρει τὸ ἄρτον ὃν παρέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ ἡμετερόν χειρὸς ΠΟΙΕΙΝ ὡς ἀνάμνησιν, &c. καὶ φέρει τὸ σίτημα ὁ, &c. παρέδωκεν εὐχαριστῶντας ΠΟΙΕ'Ν, φάινε. Dial. Tryph. p. 296. Apol. p. 98.

it to the Faithful, ^m who happen to be absent. This (holy Food we call the EUCHARIST, of which none are allowed to partake, but such as believe our Doctrine to be true, and have been baptized for the Remission of Sins in the Laver of Regeneration, and live according to the Laws of Christ. For we do not take these as common Bread, and common Wine, but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour was incarnate by the Word of God, and took upon him Flesh, and Blood for our Salvation: So are we taught, that this Food, blessed with Thanksgiving ⁿ οὐκ ἔστιν λόγος τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ, becomes by alteration the nourishment of our Flesh, and Blood, and is the ^o (My-
stical or Sacramental) Flesh, and Blood of the incarnate Jesus. For the Apostles in their Writings, which we call the Gospels, have thus delivered to us: That Jesus when he had taken Bread, and given Thanks gave them this Command, saying: Do this (τὸ τοῦτο ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ) in remembrance of me: this is my Body. And in like manner having taken the Cup, and given Thanks, he said, This is my Blood, and delivered it only to them.

Any Person of the Church now thus instructed in the Nature of the Eucharistical Sacrifice, and by consequence understanding the difference between the true, and old Notion of it before, and the new, and false Notion of it in, and after the ^p second Council of Nice, may justly have his Inclinations

^m As the Sick, or absent for any other just Cause.

ⁿ Mr. Reeves well observes that this is a dark, and difficult Passage, and therefore I have not translated it.

^o See Dr. Grabe upon the Place in his learned Notes on this Father's Apology. P. 128, and P. 129.

^p This Council Sess. vi. in defence of Images, and Image-Worship, denied the Eucharist to be the Image and Representation of Christ's Body, and Blood, and therefore was the first that as-
sured the Bread to be the very Body, and the Wine the very Blood of Christ after Consecration, and that they were so, and were properly so called.

checked towards any Church, which he is made to believe rejects the former, as well as the latter, which God be thanked the Church of *England* doth not, and therefore my Adversaries do her neither Honour, nor Service, who condemn this Primitive Doctrine as an *Innovation, lately coin'd, which hath not the Image of our Church upon it.* I beseech them all, but more especially Dr. *Hancock* seriously to consider these Expressions of *Justin Martyr* concerning the Eucharistical Sacrifice, or Offering, and then to say in his Conscience, if he thinks them *Metaphorical*, and to tell me, if the Doctrine of the *Representative* Sacrifice, as described by him hath any thing so *harsh, or absurd, or impossible, or impious, or false* in it, as not to admit of a *proper, natural, or literal* Sense, or supposing that the Eucharist is a real material Sacrifice, whether he speaking of it could use more plain, or express Words. The variety of so many easy, and natural Expressions for an Offering, or Sacrifice methinks should convince him of his Error, where there is no apparent Reason to think there is a Figure. And of this, which is now laid down as a *Postulatum, or Rule* in our Writers of the Popish Controversy against *Transubstantiation, and the Corporal Presence*, I desire the Doctor to take notice, and then to apply it not only to the Words of this *Father*, and the *Eucharistical Office* before described out of the *Apostolical Constitutions*, but even to those Passages of Scripture, which I produced in the *Discourse of the Christian Priesthood*, to prove the Eucharist to be a Sacrifice in a literal Sense. If he will abide by this Rule, he must quit his *strained metaphorical* Sense, and embrace the *literal*, both in the Scriptures, and in the *Fathers*, as I have shew'd many learned Men have done.

My Readers perhaps may wonder, why in the Passages I have cited out of *Justin Martyr*, I have presented

presented the Verb ποιῆν to their View in distinguishing *Capitals*, for which they may presume there is some Reason relating to the *Eucharistical Sacrifice*; and it is this: to give them Occasion to observe, as I have done, that ΠΟΙΕΙΝ, in the *Septuagints Hellenistical*, or *Hebraizin Use* of the Word signifies the same as ἱερποιῆν, or ἱεραλεῖν, to offer, or sacrifice, as פָּעַד doth in the Hebrew, and FACERE in the *Vulgar Translation*, and is so to be rendred in that Father, who plainly uses the Word in the *Ellenistical Signification* it hath in the *Seventy*, Deut. xvi. 1. where פָּעַד לַיהוָה פֶּסַח is translated ποιῆσαι τὸ πάχα κυρίῳ, FACIES phase Domino, that is, as Mr. Ainsworth glosses the Place: Thou shalt do, or make, that is celebrate the Feast of the Passover, or sacrifice the Passover. So Vatablus II. Regum XXIII. 22. Non enim celebratum fuit tale pefach. Ad verb. & Non factum fuit. The same Sacrificial Phrase is used by the Apostle of Moses, Hebr. xi. 28. ὡς ἐκ ποιῆσαι τὸ πάχα, καὶ τὸ παρῶχυσιν τῷ αἵματι. Through Faith he kept, or celebrated, the Passover, and sprinkling of the Blood. The same Phrase is used, 2 Chron. xxxv. 1. both in the Hebrew, and in the Version of the LXX ΕΠΟΙΗΣΕΝ Ἰωσίας τὸ πάχα τῷ κυρίῳ. FECIT Josias in Jerusalem, Phase Domino. So 1 Esdras i. 6. καὶ ποιῆσαι τὸ πάχα καὶ τὸ παρῶχισμα, &c. See the the same Phrases in all the three Languages, Numb. ix. 2, 5. Joshua v. 10. 2 Kings xxiii. 22. not to mention other Places, especially Ps. lxvi. 15. where I will offer unto Thee Burnt Sacrifices, is in the Hebrew, I will do, which the LXX gloss by ἀνοίσω, and the Vulg. by Offeram, I will sacrifice, or offer, So Exod. xxix. 36. And thou shalt offer every day a Bullock for a Sin-Offering; it is in the Hebrew פָּעַד, and in the Greek ποιῆσαι, Thou shalt do

* Vulg. celebravit Pascha.

lxxviii To the READER.

every day a Bullock, &c. in the *Latin*, *Vitulum pro peccato OFFERES*. Mr. *Ainsworth* writes thus upon the Place: *Make*, to wit, ready for Sacrifice, that is, kill, sprinkle the Blood, offer, &c. So on Verse 38. *Make* ready, or do, that is offer unto God. So on *Exod.* x. 25. Do Sacrifice, or offer. The Word Sacrifice here understood, is elsewhere expressed, as in *1 Kings* 12. 27. And when the Word Do, or make is joined with Sacrifices, as in this Place, it signifies to offer, as *Lev.* ix. 7. 22. and xvi. 9. *Exod.* xxix. 36, 39, 41, 42. Mr. *Pool*, *Luke* xxii. 19. on the Words *Hoc Facite* acknowledges that the Hebrew *וַיִּשָּׁח* signifies to offer, but by a gross Mistake denies that the LXX ever render it by *πρωτῶν*, or that FACERE with an Accusative Case is so used in the *Latin*, which I have shew'd is not true of the *Vulg. Lat. Bible*, and by consequence of the Ecclesiastical Writers of the *Latin Church*.

According to this Sacrificial Signification of ΠΟΙΕΙΝ it is used in St. *Chrysostom's* Office of the Holy Sacrament, where at the Priests approach to the Altar, the Deacon saith to him, *ἡ νῦν ὥρα τῆς προσφορᾶς τῷ κυρίῳ*, it is the time to offer, or sacrifice to the Lord. Upon which the learned Editor hath this Note: *Diaconus tribus digitis stolam tenens, & Altare indicans divinum, & tremendum Sacrificii mysterium, ut Sacerdos aggrediatur admanet: & Domini verbis ——— praterea faciendi verbum ad sacrificia pertinet. Hinc Varro Lib. V. de lingua Latina "Agnam Jovi facere, & similiter Virgilius facere vitulum pro frugibus: rursusque idem Varro*

* Heb. *וַיִּשָּׁח* interdum valet offerre.

* *Missa Sancto Chrysost.* in *Goars Rituale Græcorum*. P. 64.

* P. 122.

* This is an Error. For it is: *Flamen Dialis agnam Jovi facit.* And so in *Virg.* *facere vitula*, and the Places are so cited by *Briffon.* de *formulis* P. 22. But the *Latins* say *Facere Rem divinam, & sacra facere.*

pontificis nomen tradit ex eo deducum, quod potens sit facere, id est. Sacrificare, nec ignota est Hebraeis, addit Pineda in JOB, hæc loquendi ratio: ubi enim in Psalm. LXVI. Legimus Offeram tibi boves cum Hircis, Hebræa litera habet faciam Tibi Boves cum Hircis. Et pariter Exod. xxix. ubi habemus: Vitulum pro peccato offeres, legit iterum Hebræa facies. Et eodem faciendi verbo utitur Christus in hujus Sacrificii institutione dicens, Hoc facite in mei memoriam, & de Altaris sacro ministerio loquens Ambrosius Missam, inquit Epist. 33. facere coepi. Καὶ ἐὼς ἐρῶ τὸ ἑορτάζειν τὰς χυρὰς — & pari ratione admonet Diaconus Latinus Sacerdotem: Immolet Deo Sacrificium Laudis.

According to this Sacrificial Use of the Verb *ποιᾶν*, *facere*, and in particular from the Paschal sacrificial Signification of it, we may justly observe, that the words *τὸ τοῦ ποιᾶν*, *Hoc facite*, in the Institution of the Holy Sacrament either relate to the whole Action, as *כָּל* in the Hebrew and *τὸ τοῦ* in the Greek do to the whole Service of the Passover, Exod. xii. 27. and then it proves the Celebration of the Eucharist to be *ἱερόνοια*, or *ἱερέυια* a Sacrificial Service, and Ministration, or else they relate to the Bread, and Wine, and then by natural, and easy Interpretation they may be interpreted thus: *Take, eat, this is my Body, offer this in remembrance of me: And, This is my Blood — offer this, as oft as you shall drink it, in remembrance of me.* Either of these Senses of *τὸ τοῦ ποιᾶν*. *Hoc facite*, which do not differ much, give us a good account of the Reason, why the ancient Fathers treating of this *Mystery* say,

▼ *Irenæus. Lib. IV. Cap. xxxiv. Igitur Ecclesiæ oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri in Universo mundo observa, quam frequenter, graviter, & nominatim ut Christum Dominum auctorem & institutorem esse Sacrificii Eucharistiæ Fenard. Sic à Sancto Cypriano CHRISTUS hujus Sacrificii Auctor, & Doctor dicitur Epist. 63. Grabe in locum. See P. xxx, xxxi. of this Epist. to the Reader.*

that it is *the Oblation of the Church, which Christ appointed to be offered.*

I must here say, as I did in my *Discourse of the Christian Priesthood*, that there is no Reason, why the Reformed should be afraid of believing the Holy *Eucharist* to be a *Sacrificial Service*, or the *Bread*, and *Wine* to be the proper Oblations of it, forasmuch as according to the Ancients before the Eighth Century, we teach them to be not the *Real*, but only the *Mystical*, or *Sacramental Body*, and *Blood of Christ*. Nay * with *St. Augustin* we assert, that to say they are the *real* natural Body and Blood of Christ is *absurd, impious, and impossible*, and that the Words *This is my Body*, and *This is my Blood* can be true only in a *figurative* Sense. There is therefore a very plain and intelligible difference between the *Eucharists being the Sacrifice of the real Body, and Blood of Christ*, and its being a *real Sacrifice of his mystical Body, and Blood*. They are inconsistent, and impossible one with the other, because *mystical*, and *real* differ as much as the Substance, and its Shadow: the Verity, and its Type, or a thing of any sort or kind from the thing that is its Image. All this is comprehended in the distinction betwixt *Mystical*, and *Real*; the one as I have said is a contradiction, and bar to the other, and therefore great must be their Ignorance, or Prejudice who cannot distinguish the pure *Primitive* from the *Popish* Doctrine of the *Eucharist*, and where Ignorance, or Prejudice is not in the Case, it must be evil Designs, and Passions, that make Divines especially inveigh

* *De Doctrina Christiana Lib. tertius.* Si praeceptiva locutio est aut flagitium, aut facinus vetans, aut utilitatem, aut beneficentiam jubens non est figurata locutio. Si autem flagitium, aut facinus videtur jubere, aut utilitatem, aut beneficentiam vetare, figurata est. Nisi manducaveritis, inquit, carnem filii hominis, &c. facinus, vel flagitium videtur jubere, figura est ergo. &c.

against their Brethren, who teach the Sacrament of the *Lord's Supper* to be the representative Sacrifice of Christ's mystical Body, and Blood. Whether or no my Adversaries be Men of the latter sort, I leave it to their Readers to judge. If they be, God be praised for it, this Age is so happily enlightened with the Knowledge of that truly Primitive Doctrine, that it is not in their Power as it was seventy Years ago, to enrage, and raise the People against the Teachers of it, or make them be persecuted for preaching of it, or for their Practice in ministering of it as such. No, thanks be to God, it is otherwise now: But if it were not, I should not be afraid to declare that the Holy Sacrament shall be a Sacrifice to me both in *Theory*, and *Practice*, till those Gentlemen can convince me I am in the wrong by better Authorities, and Reasonings against it, than I have here, and elsewhere brought for it, which upon Reflection upon what hath been written against it from the first beginning of the Controversy about 1637. to the *Triumvirat*, that hath lately opposed it, and me, I think I have no Reason to expect. But if contrary to my Expectation they can bring better Authorities, or invalidate mine, I will be their Convert, for I have no worldly Interest to be of this Opinion, nor ever could have any; or if I had, I hope by God's Grace no such *Interest* should prevail with me to persist in Error against Truth. In the mean time I shall believe the Holy Eucharist to be an ^a unbloody Sacrifice, and
of

^a In the Discourse of the Christian Priesthood.

^b *Lightsfoot* in Cap. xxvi. Matth. *Prætereundum non est, quod ille poculum Eucharisticum instituens dicat, Hoc est sanguis meus N. Testamenti*, ut Matth. & Marc. imò ut Lucas & Paulus, *Hoc poculum est Novum Testamentum in Sanguine meo. Non sigillum tantum foederis, sed & Sanctio Novi foederis: Terminus Oeconomiae Aeternae, & Sanctio novæ veteris foederis Sanctio erat*

of a Sacrificial Nature for the Seal and Sanction of the New Covenant in the whole Ministration, and all the Parts, and Rites of it from *presenting* the Bread, and Wine to God upon the Altar, to the *Consumption* of them in the holy, foederal, and sacrificial Feast: And that this Notion of it is most suitable to the Evangelical Covenant as a Seal, and Sanction thereof, and altogether worthy of the New, and Royal Law, and of its *one Law-giver* the Antitypal *Moses* our Lord *Jesus Christ*. And as I believe it to be a Doctrine, and Institution most agreeable to Christianity, as the *Mystical Judaism*, to have one Sacrifice succeed in ^a the room of all the Jewish Sacrifices: So I think it very proper not only to illustrate the Nature of the Holy Eucharist, as a Sacrament, but to render the Mystery more ^b tremendous, and adorable,

per Sanguinem Taurorum, & Hircorum. *Exod. 24. Hebr. 9.* quia fundendus erat Sanguis: *Novi* per poculum vini, quia sub Novo Testamento nulla ulterius sanguinis effusio.

^a V. 26. ὅτι ἐστὶ τὸ Σῶμα μου. Applicata hæc ad Pascha recens jam comestam clarius elucescunt. Hoc jam est corpus meum eo sensu, quo extitit Agnus paschalis corpus meum hucusque. Et Versu 28. Hoc est Sanguis meus Novi Testamenti eodem sensu, quo sanguis Taurorum, & Hircorum fuit sanguis meus sub Veteri. *Exod. 24. Hebr. 9.* Idem in *Evang. Lucæ Cap. xxii. V. 19.* Hoc est Corpus meum, propter præsentem Paschatizationem respicere optime possunt hæc verba Corpus agni paschalis Corpus, inquam, agni paschalis, nam ipsissimam istam Phræseologiam de eo adhibent Judæi. τὸτο τὸ ποτήριον. Respici videtur ad poculum vini effusum quotidie in libaninibus cum Sacrificio jugi, nam & illud effusum pro remissione peccatorum, ut panis respiciat Corpus Sacrificii jugis, & poculum, Vinum Libationis. Idem. in *Epist. 1. Cor. Cap. xi. V. 25.* De Sanguine tum sparso [super Duodecim Columnas] dici potuit hic est sanguis Christi veteris vel primi Testamenti. Ipse sanguis tunc & exinde representabat sanguinem Christi, quia sub veteri Testamento futura erat de tempore in tempus effusio sanguinis. At jam vinum est representatio sanguinis Christi, quia exinde cessatura erat effusio sanguinis istiusmodi.

^b *Jo. Chrysost.* on *Matth. xxvi.* calls the Holy Table *τὸ ἐξαιρετικὸν πρὸς τὴν*, the most tremendous Table, in *1 Epist. Cor. Cap. x. Τὸ λίγος*

adorable, and the Christian Priesthood more venerable, and the Devotion of the Faithful more flaming both before, at, and after the Holy Communion, as furnishing of them with special, and proper Matter not only for holy and comfortable Meditations, but for Prayers, and Praises to the Father, and Intercessions with him in the Name of his Son Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost, to whom with the Father in the Unity of the Trinity be all Honour, Worship, and Glory now and ever. *Amen.*

I think I have now said enough to my Adversaries in Vindication of my Doctrine of the Holy *Eucharist*, which in my *Discourse of the Christian Priesthood*, I asserted to be a *real*, and *proper*, *external*, *material* Sacrifice of Bread, and Wine, which Christians offer to God to represent, commemorate, and shew forth before him the All-sufficient *Sacrifice*, which his Son once made of himself upon the Cross for the Sins of the whole World. And in particular I think I have said as much, if not more, than my present Design required in Defence of my self, and that Notion against Dr. *Hancock*, who as yet hath made no Reply to the ingenious, and learned Author of *Censura Temporum*, by whom in *February* last he was so well answered, and chastised.

λέγει, ὁ Μακάριος Παῦλος, θέλων ἐνδείξαι τὴν Ἀκερατὴν, καὶ
μυστηρίων μνημονεύει φεικτῆς εὐλογίας ποιήσιον τὸ φοβερὸν δὴ
φεικωδέστατον ἐκείνο — ἐηαῦθα ὅτι ἐπὶ τὸ πολλὰ φεικωδέστατον,
καὶ μετριοπρεπέστατον τὴν ἱερουργίαν μετεχέσσει, ὅτι τὴν Θεοῦ
αὐτῷ ἀμείψας, δὴ αὐτὴ τὴν ἀλόγων Σφαγῆς ἐαυτὸν προσφέρει
κτείνοντας.

The CONTENTS OF THE PREFACE.

T HE Occasion of writing these Letters.	Page vii
The Author of the Letter to a Romish Priest.	viii
Her great Knowledge in the Popish Controversy.	ix
Her Books of Devotion.	x
An Account of the Third Part of this Book, and its Author.	xiii
The Author of the Antidote against Popery.	xiii
The Design of the rest of the Book	xiv
Some Reflections upon a late Discourse against the Holy Eucharist's being a true commemorative Sacrifice.	xv
The Doctrine of this Sacrifice asserted in a Discourse printed in 1682, but written in 1637.	xvi
By Archbishop Bramhall.	xvii
By Dr. Brough.	xviii
By Mr. Thorndike.	ibid.
By Bishop Beverege.	xxii
By the Author of the Clergy-man's Vade Mecum.	xxiv
By Dr. Potter.	xxvii
The Answerer's Contempt of the Fathers animadverted upon.	xxxiii
Mr. Bingham's Testimony to the Doctrine of the Christian Sacrifice.	xxxvii
Part of a Prayer in Bishop Andrew's Greek and Latin Devotions.	xxxix
Mr. Nelson vindicated.	xl and lvii
A Citation out of the Apostolical Canons.	xi
Mr. Mede misrepresented by the Answerer in many Places.	xl
A farther Appeal to the Apostolical Constitutions.	ibid.
As likewise to Jusſin Martyr.	xlvi and lxxiii
And	

The CONTENTS.

<i>And to all the Eucharistical Offices of the ancient Churches.</i>	xlviii
<i>Dr. Hancock calls for express and plain Scripture for this Christian Sacrifice.</i>	xlix
<i>A Testimony of Bishop Beverege brought against him.</i>	1
<i>The Council in Trullo appeal'd to.</i>	li
<i>The Doctrine of Brissotius concerning the Nature of a Sacrifice enquir'd into.</i>	ibid.
<i>And of Suidas.</i>	lii
<i>Πεσφάγω, & Offerre, used in the Greek and Latin Churches for the Celebration of the Eucharist.</i>	ibid.
<i>Some farther Remarks from the forementioned Authorities.</i>	liii
<i>The Word Sacrament not to be found in Scripture.</i>	lvi
<i>The Sacrifice of the Eucharist no Stranger to the Communion-Devotions of the Church of England.</i>	lviii
<i>The Vindicator of the Church and Clergy of England considered.</i>	lxv
<i>Several Reasons why this Author could not be Dr. Kennet.</i>	lxvii
<i>Dr. Jo. Edward's Strictures slighted</i>	lxxi
<i>The Disingenuity of making this Doctrine introductive of the Popish Mass.</i>	lxxii
<i>Ποιεύ shew'd to be a sacrificial Term in the Hellenistical Style.</i>	lxxvii
<i>No reason why the Reformed should be afraid of believing the Eucharist to be a sacrificial Service.</i>	lxxx

The CONTENTS of the LETTERS.

A	<i>Lady inclinable to embrace the Roman Communion is visited by the D. at the Request of a Friend, in order to prevent her Apostacy from the Church of England.</i>	<i>Page 1</i>
	<i>The Danger of trusting our selves alone with the Adversaries of our Religion, and neglecting the Advice of our own Divines, observed, &c.</i>	<i>2</i>
	<i>The Objection of our receiving our Faith from the Church of Rome,</i>	<i>c 3</i>

The CONTENTS.

Rome, answered.	2, 3
The Vices objected against Hen. 8. or any other of the Reformers no just Argument against the Reformation.	3
The Method propos'd by the D. in order to resettle her in the Church of England. Two Books in the mean time recommended to her reading.	4
A Letter of Thanks from the Lady to the D. with the Request of a Conference with him; which is granted.	5
Several Objections made by the Lady against the Church of England. Obj. 1. Against the many Heresies and Schisms, &c. amongst us since the Reformation. A Book wrote by the D. some time ago, recommended to her perusal to clear that Objection.	6
Obj. 2. The Necessary of an infallible Judge. The Answer refer'd to at the end of this Collection.	p. 7
The last Objection whereupon she laid the greatest Stress was against the Validity of our Ordinations	ibid.
A Paper left by the Lady with the D. in Answer to that part of her Book (recommended to her reading) concerning the Novelty of the Roman Faith, to which she desired a Reply, which is the occasion of the following Treatise.	7, 8

The most material Contents of the foremention'd Paper. Part the First.

T HE Author of the Paper his Explanation of Ver. 3. of St. Jude's Epistle, To contend for the Faith once delivered to the Saints.	9
Every Doctrine of Faith not necessary to be known by every Christian; but when known to be believed.	ibid.
The proposing Doctrines of Faith once deliver'd to the Saints in opposition to new Errors, no coining of new Doctrines.	10
This to be done, as often as Errors arise, by the Successors of the Apostles as they themselves did. Acts 15. ver. 6, and 12, and by the same Authority.	11
Such new Apostolical Declarations (as he terms them) against new Errors, are to be register'd into the Catholick Creed, as so many new Articles; yet the Doctrine not new, being the same once delivered to the Saints.	11, 12.
His Answer to the Challenge in the D's Book, Where was the Church and Trent-Doctrine before Luther? By asserting the Antiquity of the Doctrines charg'd upon the Church	

The CONTENTS.

<i>Church of Rome to be novel.</i>	11, 12
<i>His Defence of the Council of Trent from imposing any Innovations.</i>	13
<i>He charges Protestants with living in Schism from the Catholick Church.</i>	14, 15
<i>A farther Assertion of the Antiquity of those Doctrines, which we charge upon them as new.</i>	15

PART II.

<i>His Defence of the Bishop of Meaux against Dr. Bull.</i>	16
<i>The Term Catholick Church explain'd, with some Reflexions on Dr. Bull.</i>	17, 18, 19
<i>The D's Answer to the Letter sent by the Lady with the fore-mention'd Paper enclosed, wherein he complains of the weak and fallacious Arguments made use of as an Answer to the Passages referr'd to in his Book, and to which he promises a Reply.</i>	19, 20, 21
<i>Another Letter from the D. to the Lady, wherein he desires a Conference that he might make her sensible of the want of Truth and Ingenuity in the Author of the Paper above-mention'd.</i>	22
<i>The Lady's Answer, expressing some Scruples and Doubts, &c.</i>	22, 23
<i>The D's Return to that Letter, wherein he seems to doubt whether her Lapse be recoverable. However desires the Author's Vindication of his Paper, or promises a publick Answer.</i>	23, 24
<i>Another Letter from the Lady, wherein she assures the D. she is not yet so far gone, but won'd be willing to see his Answer to the Paper.</i>	24
<i>The D's congratulatory Answer that she is not yet departed wholly from the Church of England.</i>	25
<i>Another Letter from the Lady farther importuning the D's Answer to the Paper.</i>	ibid.
<i>The D's Answer, wherein he first refers to his Remarks upon that Paper in his first Letter. Then challenges her with the Promise of the Author's Vindication of it. And lastly desires to know how far her Ladyship is satisfied as to the first Objection she made against the Church of England, on account of the Sects and Schisms, &c.</i>	26
<i>The Lady's Reply, wherein she expresses her Satisfaction as</i>	

The CONTENTS.

- to the Objection last mention'd; but seems to retain her Scruples in other Points, from a Book she sends the D. together with a short Vindication of the Paper of the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints. 27
- The Vindication of the Paper of the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints. Wherein he makes the Doctrines of the Council of Trent the Doctrines of the Holy Catholick Apostolick Church; and as there can be but one Holy Catholick Apostolick Church, so all Christians are bound to her Determinations. 28, 29
- The D's Answer, he refers her to the Answer to that Book, entituled Nubes Testium. Complains of the weakness of the Vindication, wherein he only asserts without proving any thing. Concludes his Letter with serious Advice, and a hearty Prayer. 29, 30, 31
- Another Letter from the Lady, wherein she renews her Objection against the Validity of our Ordination, particularly from the omission of those Words in our Ordinal at the ordaining of a Priest, Receive thou a Power to offer Sacrifice as well for the Living as for the Dead. 32
- The D's Answer, wherein those Objections are fully answer'd, as first the misapplication of the Text, 2 Cor. xii. 14. 33
- The having Orders from the Church of Rome (if granted) no Argument to oblige us indispensably to take that Church for our Guide, when she has departed from the Truth. 34
- The Words, Receive thou a Power, &c. not used in the Church-Ordinals for above a thousand Years from Christ, prov'd from their own Writers. 35
- Another Letter from the D. to know what Satisfaction she receiv'd from the former. 36
- The Lady's Answer, wherein she still professing her self a Member of the Church of England, acknowledging the great Satisfaction she has receiv'd from the D's Arguments. But at last seems to ground her greatest Prejudices against the Church of England from some unjustifiable Practices the Members of that Church have taken up. 37, 38
- The D's Reply, wherein he repeats the Danger of conversing alone with Enemies to our Religion. The Prejudices taken against the Church of England from the Defection of some of her Members from their ancient Doctrines, no good Argument for deserting her. Especially not to be objected by

The CONTENTS.

- by the Roman Catholicks, who have been highly guilty of the same, and still many of them are so. The same Argument might be made use of against Christianity it self. Still a Remnant left in the Church of England not guilty of the Practices objected. 39, 40, 41
- The Lady's Answer. 42
- A Book recommended to the Lady's reading by the D. with a Letter wherein he expresses his Jealousy of her continuing firm to the Church of England from her taking no notice of his last Reply to her Objections. 42, 43
- The Lady's Answer. 5
- The Adversary's Sentiments of the Book sent, by the D. She assures him of her continuance in the Communion of the Church of England, by letting him know that last Sunday she receiv'd the Sacrament in this our Church of England, which if a Blessing she acknowledged in a great measure owing to him. 43
- The D's Reply, his Vindication of the Book sent, from the Calumnies thrown upon him by Gainsayers. Some Reasons mention'd, why he cannot be altogether satisfied by her Letter of her firm continuance in the Communion of the Church of England. 44, 45
- The Reply to the Paper.
- THE several Senses in which the Word Faith is to be taken, viz. in a General, Special and most Special signification. 46
- What sort of Revelations are simply and absolutely necessary to be believed, and what not. 47
- Those absolutely necessary to be believ'd, and sufficient for Salvation, twofold, Speculative, and practical Credenda, agenda. ibid.
- The D. challenges his Adversary to prove, that the Trent Doctrines requir'd by the Roman Church to be believ'd as necessary to Salvation, were deliver'd by the Apostles to the Catholick Church. 48, 49, 61, 66, 73, 81, 75, 105, 112
- The Author of the Paper's fallacious and ambiguous Application of the Word Ancient: not distinguishing it in the primary and secondary sense. 50
- His misapplying Catholicism to the Church of Rome, which was but a Sister Church to those of Jerusalem, Antioch, &c. and consequently but a part of the holy Apostolical Church, and so

The CONTENTS.

- so accounted at that time. This prov'd from the Writings of
 several Fathers.* 51, 52, 53, 54
*A Comment upon that Passage of St. Jude concerning the Faith
 once deliver'd to the Saints.* 55
*How the Term Catholick comes to be taken for Pure, Sound and
 Apostolical.* 56
*The impropriety and arrogance of the Church of Rome in
 assuming that Title.* *ibid.* 79
*The Author of the Paper's Assertion, That every Doctrine
 of Faith was never thought necessary to be known by
 every Christian, examin'd and confuted.* 58
*The same Author sophistically confounds the Doctrines of Ge-
 neral and Special Faith, in order to deceive the Lady.* 59, 60
*That summary of Faith call'd, the Apostle's Creed, design'd
 to distinguish a Christian from a Jew or Pagan, not intended
 as a Collection of all Doctrines of Faith contain'd in all the
 Scriptures.* 62
*His Objection, that the Doctrine of the Sacraments and that of
 Divine Grace, pertain to Faith, though not mention'd in the
 two Creeds, answer'd; and shewn that they are both impli-
 cily included in those two Articles, viz. The Holy Ghost
 and Communion of Saints.* 63, 64, 65
*The proposing of any new Doctrine, which is neither to be
 found in the Creeds nor Scripture, as a Doctrine of Faith
 once deliver'd to the Saints, is imposing, forging and
 coining a new Error.* 68
*The Church of Rome's setting up new Articles of Faith neither
 contain'd in the Creeds nor Scriptures, the Reason of our for-
 saking her.* 69
*The Author of the Paper's affirming, How Protestants mi-
 stake the Latins, imputing to Catholicks the coining
 of new Doctrines, &c. answer'd.* 70
*The Council of Trent deny'd to be a Free and General Catholick
 Council* *ibid.*
*The Author of the Paper's asserting in the Catholick Church
 being the Doctrines they declare from their several
 Churches, disprov'd in the Council of Trent, and from
 the Custom of Ancient and General Councils.* *ibid.* 71
*The Church of England holds no Doctrine of Faith which is not
 to be found either in the Creeds which she owns, or in the
 Holy Scriptures.* 73
How far, and in what sense the Catholick Church may be said

The CONTENTS.

to be assisted by the Spirit of Truth, and with the Presence of Jesus Christ to the end of the World.	74, 75
All Doctrines of Faith to be examin'd and prov'd by Scripture and Antiquity.	76, 77
The Author of the Paper's Question, Must not the Successors of the Apostles, &c. answer'd. With some Methods proposed, how particular or general Errors are to be oppos'd or condemned.	77
The Text quoted by that Author out of Acts xv. 28. It seem'd good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, used by the Apostles in their determination of the Case brought before them, not to be made use of in the same manner by their Successors, for several Reasons.	77, 78, 79
The only Rule to distinguish true from erroneous Doctrines is the Scriptures and consentient Antiquity: the new Articles in the Trent Council contrary to both.	80
The visibility of the Church explain'd.	82
The true Nature of the Christian Sacrifice, for which Altars were first erected.	83
Some Queries put to the Author of the Paper, concerning the Adoration of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament.	84
In which Sense the anointing of the Sick was anciently used.	84, 85
How Prayers for the Dead were used in the first Ages of the Church, contrary to the present Practice and Doctrine of the Church of Rome.	86, 87
The Author of the Paper's Fallacy, in putting, Asking the Prayers of glorify'd Saints, instead of praying to Saints, which is not only their Doctrine, but made an Article of Faith by the Council of Trent, and a part of the Office of that Church.	89, 90
The D's Defence of Sir H. Lynde, on account of what the Author seems to impute as a rash Imprecation.	ibid.
We do not say as he would insinuate, that the Council of Trent invented all the new Articles which she created into Articles of Faith, but we affirm them all to be comparatively new, as not known or taught in the Church for the first six Centuries.	91, 92
No Council can make Errors become Catholick Doctrines of Faith; nor can any Church be Catholick, which imposes known Errors for Doctrines of Faith.	96, 97, 98, 99
	101
The	

The CONTENTS.

The Church of England, by denying the New Trent Articles to be Catholick Doctrines of Faith, clears her self from the imputation of Schism that Author unjustly charges upon her.

103

The D's Defence of Bishop Bull's Letter, concerning the Catholick Church.

106, 107

The D. shews the falsity of that Author's Definition of the Catholick Church, and the Absurdity of making the Church of Rome, and Catholick Church, convertible Terms.

109, 110

That Author's whole Paper resolv'd into six Propositions; which before the Author undertakes to prove, the D. proposes some Queries to his Consideration.

111, 112, 113, 114, 115

A conclusive Declaration.

115, ad finem.

A Lady's Letter to a Romish Priest, upon her return from the Church of Rome to that of England.

An initiatory Apology for changing her Religion for that of the Church of Rome, and returning from it again.

118, 119

The Reason of her embracing the Communion of the Church of Rome; her Youth, the Distractions and Divisions in England during the Rebellion, and the great satisfaction she promised her self in the Peace, Unity and Purity, which she expected, to find (as represented to her) in the Roman Catholick Church.

119, 120

Finding her self mistaken, she gives the following Reasons for her return to the Church of England. As first, instead of Unity she found more Divisions among them, than among those from whom she had departed.

120, 121

Episcopacy and Loyalty undervalued by many of their Schoolmen and Canonists.

122

Different translations of the Bible, one dam'd by one Pope, another by another.

123

The Pope's Supremacy asserted in some Schools, deny'd in others, condemn'd by one Bishop of Rome, assum'd and maintain'd by another.

ibid.

The fierce contentions about the Immaculate Conception.

ibid.

The next thing she complains that she found that Church defective in, was Purity of Doctrine, as in the superstitious Use made of Indulgences, Relicks, Images, Beads, &c.

124

The next: that Churches corrupt Doctrines, particularly that of Transubstantiation; with some Reflections upon it.

125

She found neither that Antiquity, Universality, nor Succession in that Church, which she expected.

126

Nor

The CONTENTS.

Nor that Government and Discipline.	127
She complains of their wresting the Scriptures to a sense the ancient Catholick Church never understood them in.	127, 128
She denies the Council of Trent to be a General Council; with her Reasons. Asserts the Polity and Succession, the purity of Faith and Worship in the Church of England, and defends her Reformation in several Instances.	128, 129, 130
As first in rectifying the Prayers and Praises to Angels and Saints, denying a Local penal Purgatory.	130
Having all her Offices in the Mother Tongue, and acknowledging a Christian Sacrifice in its just and proper sense. From whence the Lady proceeds to shew what is meant by the Word Sacrifice, and how it is used in the Roman Church.	131, 132, 133, 134
The Lady distinguishes between the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and the other Five to which the Church of Rome gives the appellation of Sacraments, viz. Orders, Confirmation, Penitence, Matrimony, Extreme Unction; and upon each of these makes her Remarks.	135, 136, 137
Then proceeds to her Observation of their so much talk'd and boasted of Miracles, made use of by their Missionaries to convert Infidels: with an Account of some Barbarities used by them in the Conversion of Heathens.	138, 139, 140, 141
The Lady's Defence of our Church and Religion, from the Objection made by the Church of Rome, that 'tis only Parliamentary; and makes a distinction betwixt the Powers of the Church and State.	142, 143
The Objection made by the Papists on the account of Antiquity, Extent, Numbers, and Universality of their Church; answered and retorted upon them.	144
Another Objection, viz. that the Church of England is in Communion with no other Church; answer'd.	145, 146
In what sense the Church of England allows Salvation in the Church of Rome.	147, 148
An Account of the Method and great Pains the Lady took to work her Conversion: With a short Defence of her self, and the charitable Conclusion of the Letter.	149, to the end.

The CONTENTS.

Queries and Answer.

A NSWER to the First Query, concerning Mother-Church.	155, 156
ANSWER to the Second, relating to Apostacy.	156, 157
The Querist's definition of Heresy too narrow.	157
Heresy is Heresy, though condemn'd by no General-Council.	158
The universal Pastorship or Papal Supremacy condemn'd as Heretical by one of their own Popes.	159
Image-worship charg'd upon them as a Heresy.	160
In Answer to that Question, Which of the Fathers ever writ against the Church of Rome? 'Tis affirm'd that those Errors were not broach'd in the Time of the Fathers, which are now charg'd upon the Church of Rome as new (false) Doctrines of Faith, as Image-Worship, mangling of the Sacrament, &c.	161, 162
A full Answer to that Question, By what Authority was the Church of Rome otherwise reprov'd? Shewing what tricking and foul Play almost every Nation met with from the pretended Council of Trent.	163, 164
The Question, If the Church of Rome be Schismatical, what Company did she leave? answer'd, she damn'd and left all except those in Communion with her self.	165, 166
The next Question answer'd, from what Body did she go forth?	167
The last Question, Where was the true Church which she forsook? Answer'd in England.	167, 168

The CONTENTS of the APPENDIX.

THE Lady being again attack'd, sends the D. a Letter (with an enclosed Paper) wherein she acquaints him with her Indisposition, and that it was insinuated to her by the Author of the Paper, that her Affliction was a Judgment upon her for not embracing the Love

The CONTENTS.

<i>Love of Truth in his way.</i>	169
<i>The Letter sent to the Lady.</i>	169, 170, 171
<i>The D's Answer. First he condoles with her, then treats of Sanctification, and the Steps leading to it; viz. Faith, Hope, and Charity, &c.</i>	171, 172
<i>Secondly, shews that what her Seducer calls Truth in their way, is Error in Doctrine, Worship, and Government.</i>	172
<i>Trent-Doctrines not of God.</i>	ibid.
<i>The Afflictions befall'n her rather to be attributed to her hearkning so long to her Adversary</i>	173
<i>A ministerial Mission not absolutely necessary to Faith and Conversion.</i>	174
<i>Private Persons have wrought saving Faith in Unbelievers.</i>	ibid.
<i>'Tis true that the ordinary way of working Faith, is by the preaching of those who are sent mediately or immediately by God.</i>	175
<i>That Preachers in all Ages have been sent about the World to preach the Gospel only by St. Peter, and his Successors, as the Vicars of Jesus Christ, is false in Fact, and contrary to the Doctrine of the ancient Fathers.</i>	ibid. 176
<i>The Church of Smyrna derives its Succession from St. John.</i>	ibid.
<i>Instances in several others.</i>	177
<i>He challenges the Seducer to disprove his Authorities.</i>	178
<i>St. Paul equal to St. Peter in the Apostolical Office.</i>	179
<i>The same Authority which was given to St. Peter, was likewise given to all the other Apostles.</i>	ibid. 180
<i>This the Seducer, if he's vers'd in the Ecclesiastical Writings, knows to be true.</i>	ibid.
<i>Challeng'd to disprove it.</i>	181
<i>The Seducer's Assertion, that our sending and preaching is by Act of Parliament, and that we call this Sent, is a Calumny,</i>	ibid.
<i>Often refuted by our Writers.</i>	ibid.
<i>The Lady desir'd to ask him a Question.</i>	182
<i>Supposing our Sending and Mission were as the Seducer says, the Lady ought not to go to the Church of Rome; because the Defects of the one will not justify the Corruptions of the other.</i>	ibid. 183
<i>What ought to be done in such a Case.</i>	184
<i>The Seducer's Confidence in saying, That Protestants must allow</i>	allow

The CONTENTS.

allow that before Luther, it was only that Body of Christians in Communion of, and Obedience to the Bishop of Rome, that was the visible Holy Catholick Church, contradicted and refuted.	185
The Greek and Oriental Churches, long before Luther, did, and still do remonstrate and protest against the Bishop of Rome.	ibid.
His telling the Lady, that those who separated from this Body, were by the Fathers in all Ages accounted Schismaticks, shewn to be a Fallacy.	186
Guilty of another collusive Expression.	187
The Doctor assures her that she's safe in the Religion of the Church of England.	188
The Grounds of Religion, or an Antidote against Popery, a Tract sent to the Lady.	189, &c.
Another Letter from the Lady to the D. She thanks him for the Arguments he has supply'd her with against the Person, who endeavour'd to pervert her.	197
She frequently objected against the Novelty of their Trent-Articles when attack'd by him.	198
What sticks with her at present.	ibid.
The Doctor's Reply.	199, &c.
Relates a Parable to her.	202, &c.
Where the Point of the Controversy about Schism lies between the two Churches.	204
The Doctor answers all her Objections, and vindicates the Reformation of the Church of England from the charge of Schism.	205, &c.

THE

THE INTRODUCTION.

ABOUT the beginning of *November 1707*, a Gentleman of my Acquaintance came to me to tell me, that a good Lady was come to Town, who had been sometime known to him, and lodg'd at his House in *Covent-Garden*; but that by a Letter from a Clergy-man in the Country, from whence she came, as well as by some things her Ladyship now and then spoke, he perceived she was inclin'd to go over to the Church of *Rome*, and fear'd she would be effectually perverted, if some timely Means were not used to prevent her unhappy change of Religion, and thereupon desired me to let him introduce me to her Acquaintance, that I might discourse with her in order to resettle her wavering Mind, which he imagined happen'd to be unsettled by the Conversation she had in the Country with a neighbouring Gentleman of the *Roman* Communion; who was himself a Person of great Parts and Learning, and at whose House she must often meet with *Roman* Catholicks of all Ranks, and among others always with their Priests. This account of the Lady invited me to ask him some Questions about her, by his Answers to which, and by the Clergy-man's Letter he shew'd me, I perceived she had long conversed in matters of Religion with them, and received all the Impressions against the Church of *England*, which the zealous Gentlemen and Ladies, as well as the Clergy of the Church of *Rome*, always endeavour

to make upon the Minds of our People; especially upon the Easy and Credulous, who hearken to all their Arguments time after time, and yet neglect to communicate them to our learned Divines, who are able to shew the Fallacies and Weakness of them, and detect their fine, but false pretensions to Antiquity, which this Lady was inclin'd to believe, particularly that precarious, vain and arrogant Pretension of their Church, of being the *One Holy Catholick and Apostolick Church*. This I perceived to be the Case of this good Lady, who was so unhappy as to trust her self alone among the Adversaries of our Religion, and to lend an open Ear to every thing they are wont to say for their own, or against the Church of *England* and the Reformation, without imparting what she heard Time after Time to learned Men, or desiring any Conference betwixt our Divines and theirs, till by degrees she had acquired a great Esteem and Veneration for the Church of *Rome*, and a suspicion joined with a mean, if not ill Opinion of the Church of *England*, and every thing that belongs to it; and as it appears from her following Letters, was really become more than half theirs. The former Experiences I have had of Women, who had thus ensnar'd themselves, made me unwilling, at my Friend's Request, to have any Conference with her Ladyship, because I feared it was too late to do her any good. But my Friend continued his importunity, desiring me to come and dine with her Ladyship, that I might have an opportunity to observe her, and then judge whether I thought her so far gone, as not to be reduced. At Dinner several Expressions fell from her Ladyship, by which I perceived she was possessed with great Prejudice against the Church of *England*. She asked me if we had not our Faith from the Church of *Rome*, and if we had, how we came to leave it? I answered, That part of our *English Saxon* Ancestors, which was indeed the greatest

greatest part, received their Faith from the Church of *Rome*; and that we still professed that very Faith which *St. Gregory* the Great himself professed, and sent us by his Apostle *Augustine* the Monk. But that others of our Ancestors, and other parts of our Country, received the Faith from Bishops and Priests, who did not receive it from the *Roman* Church; and that I was ready to make Proof of this before any *Roman* Priest. She also took an occasion to speak of the Reformation as brought about by King *Henry VIII.* upon whose Vices she reflected in the usual manner, as *Roman* Catholicks are wont to do, and indeed as they deserved. To this I replied, That King *Henry* dyed a *Roman* Catholick, that it was not he, but his Son King *Edward VI.* who, under God, was the happy Instrument of our Reformation; but that if it had been King *Henry VIII.* since God doth often bring about his Purposes by the instrumenty of the worst Men, the Vices of that Prince would have been no good Argument against the Reformation, because it was the Duty both of Prince and Priests, and People, to contribute their joint Endeavours to so good and necessary a Work. I told her Ladyship farther, that the Question between the *Roman* Catholicks and us ought to be, Whether there was just Cause for a Reformation? and if there was, the Vices of the Reformers were foreign to the Question, even as foreign as the Crimes of *Constantine* the Great, with which some Historians tax him, were foreign to his Reformation of the Pagan World into Christianity, for which I supposed her Ladyship would not deny, but there was just Cause, and that it was a blessed Work. After Dinner the Gentleman who invited me, pray'd her Ladyship to give him leave to ask her, if she was already reconciled to the Church of *Rome*; because if she were not, but was free to hear the Divines of the Church of *England*, he told her I would be willing to discourse with her

from time to time in the Audience of any of the *Roman* Religion, or otherwise, as she pleased, in order to resettle her in the Church, to whose Communion she had been for many Years so firm, and a great Ornament. This gave me occasion to tell her, that I thought her Ladyship obliged in Honour and Duty to give the Church of *England* a fair and impartial Hearing before she parted from it, and in order to that to compare the Doctrine, and Worship, and Polity of the two Churches together, which I would willingly help her to do, that she might the better discern which of them was the most Apostolical, Pure and Primitive; and that it concerned her Salvation to hearken to my Advice, because the Moment she was reconciled to the Church of *Rome*, she must be answerable to God for all the Errors, Innovations and Corruptions, with which we charged it, and have so often made good our Charge. She was pleased to thank me for the offer of my Assistance with the Civility of a Person of Quality and good Breeding, and so we parted at that time.

After she went up to her Chamber I had farther Discourse with the Gentleman of the House about her; which gave me occasion to desire him to tell her Ladyship that I recommended two Books to her reading: One of which was, *The Essay towards a Proposal for Catholick Communion, lately published by a (pretended) Minister of the Church of England, printed at large, and answer'd Chapter by Chapter.* I recommended this Book to her, because I found she was deceived with such Fallacies as are in the *Essay*, which the *Roman* Catholicks recommended to all Protestants, before this Answer to it was published, and perhaps still do. The other was a Book of several Letters, which passed between my self and a Romish Priest, printed for *Richard Sare* at *Gray's-Inn-Gate*, with Bishop *Bull's* Answer to the Bishop of *Meaux's* Letter to Mr. *Nelson*. This Book I sent to the Gentleman for her Ladyship

ship, with a Letter directing to some places, which I desired more especially her Ladyship should read: The first place was that in p. 72. where I have shew'd, That we still keep that very Faith which St. Gregory professed. And the other begins at p. 188. where I challenged the Adversary with whom I then had to deal, to shew Antiquity, Universality and Succession for their *Trent Doctrines*, or that they were involved in any of the Prime Principles or Articles of the Christian Faith, which I told him, if he could do, I would reverence, own, and honour the present Church of *Rome* as much as himself, and think her as pure Catholick and Apostolick as she was in the Primitive Times. Thus things rested for a while, till I received from her Ladyship the following Letter.

S I R,

November the 29th 1707.

W Hen I inform you that I am the Person who had the Honour of dining with you, about a Fortnight since at Mr. P——, I hope it will incline you to pardon this Trouble, when I tell you that I beg your leave that I may wait on you, in order to one Hour's Conference, which may, perhaps, be a means of removing some Scruples and Doubts I lie under. And if it may stand with your convenience, I propose to Morrow, after Evening Prayer, at your own House; to which I beg the favour of an Answer by the Bearer; by which you will oblige

Your Friend and Servant.

I returned Answer by the same Messenger who brought me her Ladyship's Paper, that the Hour she appointed was very convenient, and that I would then wait for her. She came attended with a worthy Gentleman of the Church of England,

who conducted her to my House, and I both of them up to my Study ; where after common Forms upon such Occasions, she began with a serious Air to tell me, that it was not Curiosity, but the regard she had for her eternal Salvation, that put her upon her new Enquiries, her Intention being at last to choose that Communion, in which she thought her Soul would be safe. Having reply'd, that our concern for the Soul was certainly of all others the greatest, she proceeded to give me an account of the dis-affections she had entertained against the Church of *England*, which were the very same that all Apostates from it are wont to object, before and after they are reconciled. She began to object the great number, and daily encrease of Heresies, Schisms, and religious Divisions, and Sub-divisions among us since the Reformation ; whereas the Church of *Rome* was in perfect Peace and Unity, and had but one Faith and one Worship, in which *Roman* Catholicks agreed all over the World. When she had finished this Objection I interposed, and told her she had made it very seasonably, as to the Person and Place, because I could reach her a little Book, of which, though it were of my own Writing, I would presume to say, that I had perfectly answer'd that Objection, and that if her Ladyship would read it, I doubted not, but she would receive full satisfaction from it, and be convinced of the Folly and Weakness of arguing from the *English* Heresies and Schisms, against the Church of *England* ; and I pray'd her to shew the Book to any of her new Guides, and tell them I challenged them to answer it, if they could. Hereupon I reached the Book, which she promised me to read ; and in her following Letter of *February* 2. you will find her acknowledging, that it had so satisfied her, that she would never more conclude, that Divisions and Separations were a Mark of an erroneous Church. Yet three Months afterwards she urged the same Objections against

the Church of *England*, to a learned Divine of her Acquaintance, a Fellow of a College in *Oxford*: So hard a thing it is for People, who trusting to their own Understandings, let themselves be led into Error, to get out of the enchanted Circle, and return unto the Truth. The Title of the Book, of which I have been speaking, is, *An Apologetical Vindication of the Church of England, in answer to her Adversaries, who reproach her with the English Heresies and Schisms*, printed at *London* in a second Edition, 1706. From this Objection her Ladyship proceeded to the Necessity of having an infallible Judge, which she said, the Church of *England* deny'd, owning her self to be Fallible; and this, said she, is a great discouragement from continuing in her Communion. Then she proceeded to object against the private Spirit of interpreting Scriptures and Fathers, and the Absurdities and Inconveniencies which, she said, followed upon it; and then observed as another Objection, that the Protestants were not in Communion with one another; and in particular, that our Church was not in Communion with any other Church; an Objection, which I think is well answer'd in the Letter of a Lady converted from Popery, printed in this Collection. Some other Objections she made, which being of less Moment I have forgot; but that upon which she put the greatest stress, was her Objection against the Validity of our Ordinations, which was altogether of the same nature, and to the same purpose with what you will find she hath written in her Letter of *February* 17. When she had done objecting she thanked me for my *Book of Letters*, which passed between me and the *Romish* Priest, and told me, that which made the greatest Impression upon her, was what I had written at the 188th and following Pages, concerning the Novelty of the *Roman* Faith; but then she told me, that in Answer to it, she had brought a Paper, of which she desired my Thoughts as

soon as my Leisure would give me leave to write them. I promised her Ladyship to peruse it, and send her my Opinion of it, which you will find in the next Letter, and in another dated *January 23*. As to all her Objections, but the first, for Answer to which I referred to my *Apologetical Vindication*, I told her, that each of them would require a particular Conference, in which I hoped, by God's Assistance, to answer them all fairly and fully to her Satisfaction; adding, that I would allot her times for as many Conferences as she should appoint, at which I desired that the Gentleman, who then attended her might be present; saying again, that by God's Blessing I hoped she would receive satisfaction; but to this she returned no encouraging Answer, seeming to doubt of what I hoped. The Paper she left with me is this, which I present to the World entire, with all its strength of Reason, force of Argument, correctness, and charming Sweetness of Stile, and other not common Beauties and Embellishments, which perhaps do not shew themselves to so much Advantage in my Answer to it; wherein I was forc'd to divide it into Parts, into Periods, and now and then into Half-periods, as well as into Paragraphs, and sometimes into half Paragraphs. But here it lies whole, and open to the Reader's view, without any discontinuance or disjointments; and after he hath read it, perhaps he will be of my Opinion, that he hath read few controversial Papers like it, unless it be the Author's Defence of it, which follows in the Lady's Letter, dated *February 2. 1707*.

That

That the Doctrines declared by the Council of Trent to be de Fide are ancient, tho' the Form of professing them, call'd, The Creed of Pius IV. be New. In Answer to some Passages in Dr. George Hickes's Book.

PART I.

WE are taught by St. Jude the Apostle, Ver. 3. *To contend for the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints.* Now I pray let me ask who were those Saints, that Body of Men to whom the Apostle affirms, the Faith was once delivered? Most certainly it was that Body of Men signified by the 9th Article of the Creed, *The Holy Catholick Church*; to these the Faith was once delivered, and for this Faith we are commanded to Contend, as necessary to Salvation. Not that every Doctrine of this Faith was ever thought necessary to be known by every Christian; but when known, was necessarily to be believed. Wherefore there being this material difference among the Doctrines of Faith, that some are necessary to be known by every Christian, and others not: The Apostles first, and after their Example the Pastors of the Catholick Church in succeeding Ages, gathered together Doctrines necessary to be known by all Men into a certain Form call'd a *Creed*. But neither the Apostles, nor the *Nicene* Fathers, made it an Article of their Creed, that the *whole* Faith once delivered to the Saints is contained therein. For Example, Neither what a Sacrament is, nor the number of Sacraments is expressed in those Creeds, and yet these are of the Faith once delivered to the Saints.

Saints. So also the Doctrines concerning Divine Grace pertain to the Faith once delivered to the Saints, tho' the two Creeds mention'd say nothing of them: Wherefore these Creeds were not compos'd to contain the *whole* Faith, but so much of it as is necessary to be known by every Christian. But what if Errors arise, destructive to other Doctrines of Faith, which are not expressed in these Creeds, must the Saints to whom the Faith was once deliver'd, or their Successors, sacrifice Divine Doctrines to Error, and not contend for them; because they are not expressed in those Creeds which we know neither do, nor ever were intended to contain the whole Faith once deliver'd to the Saints? Wherefore as Errors arise from time to time, we are to propose that Doctrine of Faith once delivered, which impugns the Error. Now the proposing a Doctrine once delivered to the Saints against an emerging Error, can't be said to be the Coyning of a Doctrine, but the Use of that Faith once delivered. I hold it as an Article of my Faith, that no Authority on Earth can set up new Doctrines of Faith, but it is as much an Article of my Faith, that we must contend for the *whole* Faith once deliver'd to the Saints; of which many Doctrines are not expressed in the mentioned Creeds, and yet held to be of Faith by Protestants, as that Baptism and the Lord's-Supper are Sacraments, and necessary to Salvation. The mistake of Protestants, in imputing to Catholics that they coin new Doctrines, proceeds from this, That in Cases of Debate, the Catholick Church assembled by its Representatives in a Council, decides the Dispute, by proposing the Doctrine once deliver'd to the Saints against a new Error: So that tho' the declarative Sentence of the Catholick Church be New, as the opposite Error is New which occasion'd it; yet the Doctrine then declar'd, is that which the Fathers brought to the Council, to which
they

they come as Witnesses and Reporters from their several Churches, and consequently the Doctrine not New. It is evident, that Protestants hold many Doctrines not expressed in the mentioned Creeds, and therefore ought not to find fault with Catholicks on that score. In fine, we must contend for the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints, and in disputes about it; for Heresies will be: We must have recourse to the Saints to whom it was deliver'd; to wit, the Holy Catholick Universal Church assisted by the Spirit of Truth, and with the Presence of J. C. always to the end of the World.

None can deny but new Errors, Heresies will, or may arise in all Ages: In which Case what is to be done by that Authority which Christ has establish'd in the Holy Catholick Church, to maintain and uphold every Doctrine of that Faith once deliver'd to the Saints? Must not the Successors of the Apostles convene from all parts of the Catholick World, as in *Acts* 15. 6. The Apostles and Ancients assembled to consider of this *Word*? And these, as often as new Errors arise, declare against them, as the Apostles did *Ver.* 28. *It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us.* For unless this Apostolical Authority, of declaring what is Faith be continu'd in their Successors, the Holy Catholick Church is left helpless against emerging Errors and Heresies. Now these declarations are indeed New, as the Errors are New, against which they are made: But the import of them, or Doctrine proposed to the Church by them, is as ancient as the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints: And these declarations of the Ancient, are immediately register'd into the Catholick Creed, and become so many Articles: So that as new Errors spring, new declarations are made by Apostolick Authority, and these new declarations are so many new Articles; yet the Doctrine imported by these is always attested by
Catholick

Catholick Authority to be the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints, for which we must contend : Wherefore the talk of new Articles is but a Bugbear to frighten Men from receiving ancient Faith. The Apostolick declaration of a Doctrine, which is the Article registred in the Catholick Creed is New, as the Error it condemns is New : But the Doctrine no other than the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints, and to be found in the Writings of the ancient Fathers.

And now to speak to the Challenge, p. 190. " Where was the Church and *Trent* Doctrine before *Luther* ? I answer, It was where it is, viz. In the Month and Practice of the visible Apostolick Catholick Church of all Ages, as the Writers in every Age testify ; some mentioning this *Trent* Doctrine, and others another. The World is fill'd with the Quotations of such Writers, and in practice, Altars were every where erected for Christian Sacrifice ; People in all Nations ador'd Jesus Christ in the Sacrament, anointed the Sick, pray'd for the Dead, ask'd the Prayers of glorified Saints, just as they did at *Trent*, if you will believe the ancient Fathers, whose Writings are express and many. An Author, p. 190. must appear rash to his own Party, who calls God and his Angels to witness, that the *Trent* Faith and Doctrine was far from the knowledg of Jesus Christ and his Apostles : He had need to have been an Eye-Witness of all that Jesus Christ and his Apostles did, and himself to have heard all they taught, to make so bold with God and his Angels, as to call them to witness what he affirms without being able to offer the least positive Proof ; nay, one would think him frantick against himself, when he wishes all the Anathema's of the Council of *Trent* to fall on his Head, if the *Roman* Faith have Antiquity, Uni-

versality and Succession in all Ages: Whereas *Roman* Catholicks manifestly prove their Antiquity from Primitive Fathers, their Universality from the agreement of General-Councils, and Succession from an uninterrupted Practice: Again, he wishes himself the same Mischief, if the *Trent* Articles were commonly and continually taught and received *de Fide*, as Articles of Faith before *Luther*. I answer, That if by *Trent* Articles he means a particular Form and Dress of Words fram'd at *Trent* to express Catholick Doctrines; that indeed, that Form and Dress is New; but the Doctrines are the same which all Ages have brought down to us, as appears from the sprinklings of Primitive Writers and uninterrupted Practice; and are no more *Trent* Doctrines than they were always the Doctrines of all Catholick Nations.

And now, I pray, observe the Fallacy of some Men, and the Mistake of others, who complain of *Roman* Catholick Doctrines and *Trent* Articles with one and the same Breath, as if both were New: And some are so easy as to let themselves be persuaded, that the Council of *Trent* having invented the Doctrines, erected their own Inventions into Articles of Faith: Others as nonsensically are persuaded, that the Doctrines in question were once peculiar to the Church of *Rome*, and that other National Churches, which with that of *Rome* compose one Catholick Church, did not rank them among the Doctrines of Faith once deliver'd to the Saints, and consequently they were not Universal and Catholick; but that the Pope by managing the Council of *Trent*, engag'd the Fathers of that Council to draw up those peculiar *Romish* Doctrines into Articles of Faith; and conclude, that these Doctrines have been no longer Catholick than they have been trim'd into Articles by the Council of *Trent*, and say, that before the Council they were only *Romish* Doctrines, but that this Council having
 70 put

put them into Articles of a Creed, from that time they first began to be Catholick and Universal ; so that the Doctrines which at first were only Errors of the Church of *Rome*, became Errors of the Catholick. And this nonsensical Whim, repugnant to all Truth of Fact and History, prevails so much as that Thousands who even doubt of their Salvation, by living in Schism from the Catholick Universal Church, yet foolishly think themselves of so tender Consciences that they can't safely be united to the Catholick Church of their Time, because the Errors which were once peculiar to the Church of *Rome*, are by the Pope's Management of the Council of *Trent* become Catholick. What I now say God knows with too much Truth, furnishes a plain Answer to a Query, which puzzles many wiser than my self, *viz.* How comes it to pass that some Protestant Divines of a prodigious Learning, who have writ to admiration to prove, that the One true Church of Christ can be no other than Catholick, and yet have stood off from the Catholick Church of their Time. And whilst they preach Damnation to all that are not united with the Catholick Church in all outward Communion, they themselves are not united ? The true Reason hereof is, that they find the Doctrines of the *Roman* Church to be the Doctrines of the Catholick, and therefore choose rather to live in Schism from the Catholick, than embrace *Roman* Catholick Doctrines.

These Divines forced as it were by an Exorcism of Truth, extol the Authority of the Catholick Church in defining against Hereticks in the first as General Councils, and tell you, that if they had liv'd in those Catholick Days they must either have been in Communion with that Catholick Church, or have been damnable Schismaticks. That, say they, was a Catholick Church indeed, free from *Romish* Errors ; nor were the *Trent* Articles,

or

or the Creed of *Pius IV.* known to that Catholick Church. But did not the Fathers of that very Catholick Church erect Altars, offer Sacrifice, pray for the Dead; call upon the Saints to pray for them, and make Appeals to the Supreme Pastoral Authority of the Bishop of *Rome*? Are not these the Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, which you call Errors? And because they are visibly the Doctrines of the Catholick Church of our Time, you rather choose to live Schismatics than Catholics? All the difference I can see between the ancient Catholick Church which they extol, and the Present which they blame, is, That the Ancient, tho' it taught the same Doctrines as the Present, as appears from the numberless Quotations of the ancient Fathers, yet they taught and practised those Doctrines with less noise than the Present: There was then no noise of a Creed and Articles about them. Nor would there be now had not the perverse opposition of *Luther* against these Doctrines, moved the Catholick Church to declare by the living Voice of the Council of *Trent*, that these Catholick Doctrines both of former and that Age were Apostolical, and pertained to the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints; for which they ought to contend. Indeed it seems to me very nonsensical, to extol the Authority of the Catholick-Church in defining Matters of Faith in the first Four General Councils, and reject that Authority in after Councils; seeing all the advantages applicable to the first Four General-Councils are but so many Consequences drawn from the Truth of the 9th Article of the Creed; and the Promises of the Divine Spirit and the Presence of Christ to his Apostolick Holy Catholick Universal Church; all which Advantages, if that Article be still true, pertain as much to the present Catholick as to the former. And had I liv'd then, I should have heard the same Catholick Doctrines and seen the same Worship I do
now

now, tho' I should not have heard them drest into Articles of a Creed as now. And this is all the difference, and for this Men will live Schismatics. O senseless Galatians! who hath betwitch'd you not to obey the Truth?

PART II.

THIS is so unaccountable that one would think it impossible that Dr. Bull could be Author of that excellent piece of Learning, intituled, *Judicium Ecclesie Catholicae trium primorum Seculorum, &c.* i. e. *The Judgment of the Catholick Church of the Three first Ages*, and be the Writer of an Answer, p. 232. bearing his Name to a Letter to the Bishop of Meaux, in which the Bishop congratulates him for the Service he had done the Church Catholick; but wonders that so great a Man, who speaks so well of the Church, &c. can be a Moment without acknowledging her. The Doctor tho' in composing his Book very acute, in his Answer mention'd seems hard of Understanding, and knows not what Church the Bishop means; but asks *Her*, *What Her doth he mean?* Altho' all the Bishop had to say of him was, as he tells him, *For the Service he had done the Church Catholick*, yet this great Doctor is at a loss to know what *Her* the Bishop means? Sir, it is to that *Her*, to which the Bishop said you had done Service, and which he styles *L'Eglise Catholique*, The Church Catholick. Why then will you ask what *Her* the Bishop means? and put upon him unhandsomly your own, not his meaning, *That doubtless he means the present Church of Rome*. Sir, he means what he says, he says the Church Catholick; and it's that he means, and wonders how you that have done such Service to the Church Catholick, can be a Moment without acknowledging her. Again, Sir, you say that the Bishop seems to think the Roman and the Catholick Church

Church to be convertible terms, which, say you, is strange in so learned a Man. Indeed it is strange you should imagine he thinks so, for in putting the Question, what is it you mean by the word Church Catholick? He asks you whether it be the *Roman Church* and *those that adhere to her*? The *Anglican Church*, or a confused Number of Societies separated one from the other? Wherefore a Man of less Capacity than Dr. Bull may see that the Bishop puts not the *Roman Church* singly to stand for the Catholick Church: But the *Roman Church* and *those that adhere to her*; which are many National Churches, and many oppress'd Churches in Nations not Catholick; all which united with the *Roman*, are the Catholick Universal Church of all Nations under one supreme Vicar of Jesus Christ. Such a Church of all Nations and the Catholick Church are convertible terms, and no other; and therefore the Bishop in his Question ask'd, Whether not the *Roman* singly, but *whether the Roman Church and those that adhere to her, be the Catholick Church*? Indeed so much dissingenuity under so good a face of Learning as Dr. Bull carries, it is intollerable; but so it is, that when a Man of Learning applies himself to the Defence of Truth he does Wonders, but in the Moment he would set up an Untruth all his Learning leaves him to shift upon a bare stock of Confidence, in asserting and mistaking perversly every plain easy Thing that is said for the Truth; and if in Defence of Truth you say, *that Two and Two make Four*: The learned Opponent will ask you what you mean by Four. Do not you mean Three: And if you say that a Whole are *many Parts* united, he will understand that by the Whole you mean *but one Part singly*, and will think it strange that a Man of Sense should make a *single Part*, and *the whole convertible Terms*. The reason hereof is, That Dr. Bull thinks he can keep himself in Countenance, whilst he speaks against the Doctrines of a

C

particular

particular Church, be it *Roman* or what other you please. But how shall he accuse a whole Catholick Church composed of so many National Churches, to whose Judgment, next to the Scriptures, he says, p. 233. he appeals against the Oppugners of our Lord's Divinity at this Day. And therefore he will at any time stand against the Doctrines professed by the Church of *Rome*: But when these are offer'd him, as being no otherwise the Doctrines of the *Roman* Church, but as they are of the Church Catholick, he cannot understand what is meant by Church Catholick, unless it be that of *Rome*; and that the *Roman* Church and Catholick Church are understood by *Roman* Catholicks to be convertible Terms. Indeed Dr. *Bull* needs a hard Fore-head to stand his Ground against Truth. In like manner he thinks his learned Book that does so much service to the Church Catholick, flies not in his Face whilst he rejects Communion with the *Roman* Church: But when you ask him, why he is not in Communion with the present Catholick Universal? He knows not what you mean by the Church, unless it be the Church of *Rome*.

The grand Secret therefore made use of to put Men out of Conceit with these Doctrines, is never to Name them but under the Title of *Romish*, that so they may hate them, as from their Cradles they have been inured to hate the Church of *Rome* for stigmatizing other Christians with the Brand of Heresy, for not receiving her peculiar Doctrines, as of Faith. And when Men of Learning say this, it passes with the Credulous for a Truth, tho' in Fact it is very untrue, that these Doctrines are otherwise *Romish* than as they are Catholick, and equally profess'd by every other National Church, composing the body of the one holy Catholick Universal Church: Wherefore to obviate this prejudice, the Expedient is, never to discourse of them but as they are Catholick, without naming the Church of

Rome.

Rome. And then I would know whether the present holy *Catholick Church*, signified by the 9th Article of the Creed be corrupted with unholy enormous Doctrines? And if that *Catholick Universal Church*, which teaches all these Doctrines, be lapsed into a Contradictory, of being holy according to the Article of the Creed, and yet unholy according to Protestants, by reason of her Doctrines; where shall we find another holy *Catholick Universal Church* of all Nations, which teaches them not? Or shall we say, that now the Article of our Faith professing a holy *Catholick Church* without interruption, is grown false; and not only confess, that *omnis homo Mendax*, but even that the Basis of Christian Faith, to wit, the Creed and Divine Revelation is so too; which being granted, nothing remains but Atheism to fill Mens Minds.

MADAM,

December 6. 1707.

WHEN your Ladyship deliver'd me the Paper [*of the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints*] I told you I had much Business upon me, but would look over it as soon as I could. In truth I have at this time no less than three Books to look after in the Press, one Latin and two English. But yesterday at Twelve a Clock I sat down to read it, and was interrupted before I had finished the second Page: But this Morning I read it twice over, and whereas you desire my thoughts of it, in the first place I must tell your Ladyship I am much disappointed in it: For you gave it me as an Answer to the 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193 and 194 Pages of my Book, intituled, *Several Letters, &c.* and so in the Title it is said to be an Answer to some Passages in Dr. Hickes's Book.

Madam, In such a Paper pretended to be an Answer to the Passages in those Pages, I had reason to expect a proof of the Antiquity, Universality and

Succession of the *Trent-Doctrines*; and that the Author of it would have shewn me from Age to Age, out of the Fathers and Councils, that in all Times before the Council of *Trent* they were received as Articles of Faith, at least as true Doctrines in the Church. But there is no such Proof. He saith indeed, that *the Trent-Doctrines were in the Mouth and Practice of the visible Apostolick Catholick Church in all Ages, and that the Writers in every Age testify, some mentioning this Trent-Doctrine and others another.* The World (he saith) is fill'd with the Quotations of such Writers, and in practice Altars were every where erected for a Christian Sacrifice, People in all Nations adored Jesus Christ in the Sacrament, anointed the Sick, pray'd for the Dead, asked the Prayers of glorified Saints, just as they did at *Trent*: So he saith in another place, *And did not the Fathers of that very Catholick Church erect Altars, offer Sacrifice, pray for the Dead, call upon the Saints to pray for them, and made Appeals to the supreme Pastoral Authority of the Bishop of Rome?*

But, *Madam*, this is saying, but not proving: And whereas he saith the World is fill'd with the Quotations of such Writers, I must tell your Ladyship in his Phrase, that the World is fill'd with Answers to those Writers, which shew the Falseness, or Vanity, or Impertinence of those Quotations. And if this Author would answer the foremention'd Passages and Pages of my Book, as a Scholar and Divine, he ought to send me an orderly and plain Proof of the Twelve additional Articles in Pope *Pius* the Fourth's Creed, from the [every] Time of the Apostles downwards, out of the Scriptures and Writings of the Fathers and Councils; to shew, that they were always taught in the Church as Doctrines necessary to Salvation. When he can do this, *Madam*, I say here, as I said in my Book to my other Adversary, that I will be his Profelyte, and I hope you will not be his Profelyte before.

I must

I must also tell your Ladyship, First, That throughout his whole Paper he supposes the Church of *Rome* and the Churches join'd in Communion with it, to be the whole Catholick Church; which he ought to prove, because we deny it; and in particular in my Book [*of the Letters which pass'd between me and the Romish Priests*] I have shew'd it is neither the Catholick nor a Catholick Church.

Secondly, That he supposes the Council of *Trent* to be a Free and General Council, which is contrary to Fact; as your Ladyship may see in Two of their own learned Authors, who have given an account of it. Father *Paul*, in his History of the Council of *Trent*, and Monsieur *Rancin* in his Review of the Council of *Trent*. And we expect farther Proof of the evil Practices of that Council from Mr. *Aymon*, Chaplain to the late famous Cardinal *Camus* Bishop of *Grenoble*.

Thirdly, He supposes that the Council of *Trent*, as a General Council, could not err, which is not true; General Councils having actually err'd.

In the Fourth place, *Madam*, I must observe to your Ladyship, that in the Passages I have cited out of the Paper, the Expressions are fallacious and equivocal, and contriv'd to insnare and deceive; as I am willing to shew your Ladyship when you please. And to tell you my Opinion plainly of the whole Paper, it is a very weak, tho' artificial Performance, drawn up cunningly to mislead weak and willing People with Fallacies, and for that reason I must beg your Ladyship to let me keep it, till I can take a Copy of it; for I intend, God willing, to publish it with an Answer when I have leisure. In the mean time I rest

Your Ladyship's most

humble Servant

Geo. Hickes.

Pray, good *Madam*, let Mr. *B.* see this Letter and give him my humble Service.

Five Days after, with the Paper of the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints, I sent her Ladyship the following Letter.

MADAM,

December 11. 1707.

I Herewith send your Ladyship the Paper, of which I have taken a Copy. I find an utter want of Truth, and Ingenuity in it, and am willing to make good this Charge in any Conference with your Ladyship, wherein you will give me leave to read it over to you with Remarks. If your Ladyship have a mind to have it examin'd in such a Conference I desire it may be at your Ladyship's Lodgings or at my House, and that Mr. B. may be present.

If your Ladyship be not yet determin'd I shall be always ready to assist you; but if you be, all Endeavours to save you will, I fear, be to little purpose, particularly all that can be done to keep you from such an unhappy change in Religion, by

Your Ladyship's

most faithful Servant

Geo. Hickes.

Not long after I had sent her Ladyship the Paper and my Letter with it, I receiv'd this Answer from her.

SIR,

December 11. 1707.

THE Author of the Paper return'd me is not in Town, when he is I believe he will be ready to vindicate it, or if he cannot, I shall in a great measure quit my good Opinion of the Antiquity and Universality of their Doctrine; and am so much a Daughter and Friend of the Church of England, as

to wish she may be able effectually to clear up her Evidence of being a pure uncorrupt Church of God, in which Salvation may certainly be obtain'd; I should then most gladly continue a Member of it. I shall be desirous to hear your Remarks on this Paper, and in order to it will give you the Trouble of another Visit when my Cousin B——, time will permit him to accompany me. I thank you for your Concern for me, and I pray God to direct me to the true Way, which is but one, to Eternal Life. I am, Sir,

Your assured Friend and Servant.

After I had read this Letter I immediately reply'd in what follows.

MADAM,

December 11. 1707.

IN the Answer which I received to the Letter which I wrote to your Ladyship this Morning, you are not so free as to let me know whether or no you are determin'd either to go over to the Roman Communion, or, by being already reconcil'd, actually are gone over to it; perhaps your Ladyship durst not trust me with the Secret, as others have done, who were as much Strangers to me. However, your saying that you are so good a Daughter and Friend of the Church of England, as to wish she may be able effectually to clear up her Evidence of being a pure uncorrupt Church of God, in which Salvation may certainly be obtained, convinces me that if your Ladyship is not determin'd one of those Ways, that nevertheless you are too far gone for me to do you any good: For any true Son of the Church of England may say as much of the Church of Rome as you have said of her; and therefore, Madam, I think it to no purpose to have any farther Conference with you. But whereas you say the Author of the Paper will, you believe, vin-

dicate it, that, *Madam*, I desire he would do, and be so kind as to send his Vindication to me. If he proves what he writes in that Paper, I shall quickly follow you into the Church of *Rome*, but if he doth not he must expect a publick Answer, if God gives Life and Health, from

Your Ladyship's Friend and Servant

Geo. Hickes.

If your Ladyship have read the Book I lent you, I pray you to send it to me. The Book mention'd in this Postscript is the *Apologetical Vindication* above describ'd.

SIR,

December 30. 1707.

MY dismal Misfortune since I both saw or heard from you last, the Loss of my eldest Son in the Small-Pox, has prevented my not answering yours sooner; however, I am now desirous of letting you know, that I am not so far remov'd from the Church of *England* as you imagine me to be; and that I am very desirous to hear and see your Answer to that Paper I left with you: Yet notwithstanding I beg the favour of the sight of the Copy you took of it, having mislaid the Original, and I will surely return it you again some time this Week: It will come safe to me by the hand of this Bearer; which, with begging your Prayers, is all at present from

Your Friend and Servant.

The

The ANSWER.

MADAM,

December 31. 1707.

I Am sorry for your Ladyship's great Misfortune, and pray God to comfort you. I have yet made no Answer to the Paper, of which I took a Copy, waiting for another, in which your Ladyship told me the Author would prove the main Point in that of which I have a Copy. I will get my Copy transcrib'd and collated, and then send it to you in Two or Three Days. I am very glad to understand from your Ladyship, that you are not so far gone from the Church of *England* as the Expression I mention'd made me fear you were. I am with true Respect and great Concern for you,

MADAM,

*Your Ladyship's most**faithful, humble Servant,*

Geo. Hickes.

After Three Weeks her Ladyship sent me this Letter.

SIR,

January 1. 1707.

I Hope you will pardon my Importunity in begging the favour of your Opinion or Answer to that Paper of *the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints*, for my satisfaction, when your Leisure permits. This is all at present from,

*Honoured SIR,**your Friend and Servant.*

The

The ANSWER.

MADAM,

January 23. 1707.

IN your Letter of the 21st, your Ladyship desired me to let you have my Opinion of the Paper of *the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints*. In answer to which I refer your Ladyship to the Letter I sent you December the 6th, in which I plainly told your Ladyship my Opinion of that Paper; and observ'd unto you how many things were affirmed, and supposed in it to be true, which we deny, and of which we require Proof.

In your Letter to me of December 11. your Ladyship told me you believ'd the Author of the Paper would vindicate it, or if he could not, you should in a great measure quit your good Opinion of the Antiquity, and Universality of *their Doctrines*. That, *Madam*, is what I would have him prove, if he can. And if he can prove *their Doctrines*, that is, the *Trent-Doctrines* to have been always taught in the Church, as necessary to Salvation, (which I am certain he cannot do) I assure your Ladyship again, as I did in the Letter I sent you December the 11th, that I will quickly follow you into the Church of *Rome*. But if in the Vindication of his Paper, which I desired might be communicated to me, he fails of that Proof, I told your Ladyship he must expect a publick Answer from me, I will now add, or some other Person, and therefore let him consider well what he writes. I hope the Book I lent your Ladyship hath fully satisfy'd you, as to your first Objection against the Church of *England*, upon the account of the numerous Sects and Schisms among us. If your Ladyship hath read it I desire you would please to return it to

Your Ladyship's most humble Servant,

Geo. Hickes.

The

The Lady's ANSWER.

SIR,

February 2. 1701.

I Herewith return you your Book as you desired, I cannot but say 'tis very satisfactory touching the Matter it treats of, and will never conclude that Divisions and Separations are a Mark of an erroneous Church, from which they divide, any more than I can believe the *Romish* Church such, for our dividing from it; For, I think, all allow that to be a part of the holy Catholick Church, and that a sound part most of the Fathers declare, if ^a this Book I have presumed herewith to send you, quote them aright. Neither do they seem to favour that Church in matters wherein we agree, but seem to be very exprefs for it in those Doctrines wherein we dissent from them; the Pope's Supremacy, Prayers for the Dead and Transubstantiation: Which again countenance that Paper of the *Doctrine once deliver'd to the Saints*, I guess by Tradition, tho' not mention'd in the Creed, nor so expressly in Scripture as other Doctrines. What is farther deliver'd, in short, in vindication of that Paper, is contained in the inclos'd; and seeing I cannot have easy recourse to the Author, who is at a great distance from hence, shall trouble you no farther about it than to beg your Answer by way of confutation, and the return of my Book at your Leisure; with your Thoughts of it. I confess it staggers me, tho' I am not yet gone over to the Church of *Rome*, neither would I, may I be well assur'd of equal safety for my Soul in the Church I am in. But what would it Profit me to gain the whole World, and lose my own Soul; therefore I beg your

convincingest and speediest Advice, for the satisfaction of

Your Friend and Servant.

Here follows the Vindication of the Paper describ'd above, concerning *the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints*, mention'd in this Letter.

MADAM,

YOU demand whether my Church exacts as full an Assent to those Articles of the *Trent-Council*, as, &c. I pray what do you call my Church? I know no other but the *Catholick Universal Church*, which by an Article of the Creed, *both you and I are bound to believe* to be holy. And therefore pray state your Question in words that express the true Character of my Church, and ask whether the *Holy Catholick Universal Church*, &c.? And then tell me between God and your own Conscience, what difference you can imagine between the Doctrines drest into Articles by the *Council of Trent*, and the *Doctrines of the present Holy Catholick Universal Church*. For is not the intire Doctrine of those Articles profess'd this Day by the *Holy Catholick Universal Church*? And this being evident to your Eyes and Ears, it is more certain to your Understanding, that every one of them is Holy, otherwise you must contradict *your Creed*. Pray, *Madam*, tell me, is every Doctrine of Jesus Christ deposited by the Apostles in the Universal Church, equally to be believ'd? Most evidently it is. For to deny that Authority in any one thing, is to make it a *false Witness*, and to render the preaching of the Apostles void. Now we have no assured Means to know, at this Day, nor had they in any Age, what the Apostles deposited in expounding the Scriptures, but by the Testimony of the *Holy Catholick Universal Church*. Wherefore tho' some of those Doctrines are not equally

equally necessary to be known or practised by every Man, yet they all being known by the Testimony of the present *Holy Catholick Universal Church*, to have been deposited by the Apostles as pertaining to the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints, must be equally Apostolick Doctrine, and being so are equally true: And what is equally known to be true, cannot chuse but be equally believ'd, tho' not requisite to be equally practis'd by every one. Good, *Madam*, never fear to commit your self to Jesus Christ and to his *Holy Catholick Universal Church* of this Day: For the World never had but one Jesus and one *Holy Apostolick Catholick Universal Church*. And by so doing you will obtain Joy and Peace in Believing, and I exceeding Comfort, who am

Your Ladyship's

THE ANSWER.

MADAM,

February 9. 1707.

I Have been a Week from Home, which is the cause you have not heard sooner from me. I am glad * my Book was so satisfactory to you as to the first Objection you made to me against the Church of *England*, from the great number of the *English* Heresies and Schisms: Yet I do not doubt but the Missioners, (tho' they cannot answer it) and others of the *Roman* Church, will still make use of that Argument when they begin to pervert our People, as I have found by the Experience, and Observati-
on of Thirty Years, they always do.

As to the Book you sent me, Intituled, *Nubes Testium*, it was answer'd shortly after it was publish'd. The Title of the Answer was, *An Answer*

* *The Apologetical Vindication, &c.*

to the Compiler of *Nubes Testium*, wherein is shewn that Antiquity (in relation to the Points of Controversy set down by him) did not for the first Five Hundred Years believe, teach or practice as the Church of Rome doth at present. Together with a Vindication of the *Veteres Vindicati*, from the late weak and disingenious Attempts of the Author of Transubstantiation defended. By the Author of the Answer to Mr. Sclater of Putney: Printed for Henry Mortlock at the Phoenix in St. Paul's Church-Yard, 1688. Madam, if I had the Book I would send it to your Ladyship, but I suppose you may have it of the Bookseller, if it be not out of Print; or if it be, it may be had of private Persons, especially among the Clergy of the Town. It concerns your Ladyship very much to get it, and read it, and to read it diligently and impartially, without Biass or Prejudice, as you love your own Soul. It had no reply that I ever heard of, but some of the *Romanists* were so disingenuous as to print a pretended Letter from a Dissenter, to the Divines of the Church of England, charging the Author of the Answer to *Nubes Testium* with Popery; to which he publish'd an Answer, Intituled, *A Vindication of the Principles of the Author of the Answer to the Compiler of Nubes Testium from the Charge of Popery, in Answer to a late pretended Letter from a Dissenter to the Divines of the Church of England.*

The same Author also printed a Letter to Father Lewis Sabran, Jesuit, in Answer to his Letter to a Peer of the Church of England, clearing a Point in a Sermon preach'd at Chester, in Answer to a Postscript joined to the Answer to *Nubes Testium*. As also a second Letter to Father Lewis Sabran, Jesuit, in Answer to his Reply.

Madam, As to the Letter [of Vindication] you sent me inclos'd [in your Letter] if I tell you it is one of the weakest Papers I ever read, as I formerly told you the first, and larger Paper was. It supposes

supposes, and takes for granted in the same manner as the larger Paper did, That the Church of *Rome* and the Churches in Communion with it, are the *Holy Catholick Universal Church*: Whereas it is neither Catholick, as Catholick signifies Universal, nor as it hath been long us'd to signify Pure, Sound and Orthodox, but only a Part, and that a very corrupt, unsound Part or Member of the Universal Church, as the Writers of our Church have shewn again and again, and as I think I have done in the printed Letters, which passed between me and the Popish Priest. It also supposes as the larger Paper doth, that the Council of *Trent* was a General and Free Council of the Holy Catholick Church, both as Catholick signifies Whole or Universal, and as it signifies Pure, Sound and Orthodox, or right in the Faith; and that the Testimony of that Council is the Testimony of the Catholick Universal Church. But, *Madam*, to beg Questions in this pitiful manner is not to prove; and *proving*, not *supposing* is the business of the Author of the Two Papers; which if he thinks in his Conscience are for the Honour and Service of the Church of *Rome*, let him publish them, and then they shall have such an Answer as they deserve.

For Proof of them he hath by you sent me *Nubes Testium*, and to disprove that pretended Proof, I remit you both to the Answer abovemention'd. The best Advice I can give your Ladyship is to take time, and converse as freely with the Priests and knowing Lay-men of the Church of *England*, as you have long done with those of the Church of *Rome*: And to read as they direct you, and with an humble, pure Heart, to apply yourself to God alone, and only through Jesus Christ in Prayer. And to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the alone, as well as supreme Mediator betwixt God and Man, I commit your Ladyship

ship at this instant with most hearty Ejaculations,
and subscribe with all Compassion and Respect,

MADAM,

Your Ladyship's most

faithful Servant

Geo. Hickes

SIR,

February 17. 1707.

I Have the Favour of yours, and intend to give my self the satisfaction of perusing those Books you mention, and wish I may meet with desired satisfaction. There is one thing more I desire to be resolv'd in, and that is the Legality and Authority of our Priesthood, and from whom they at first deriv'd their Episcopal Orders. Most certainly from the Church of *Rome*; therefore they are our Fathers in Christ. And the Apostle observ'd, that the Children laid not up for the Parents, but the Parents for the Children; and consequently should be our Guides. But we seem to have turn'd the Tables, by which, and an Alteration in Words and Form of Ordination (which I shall here insert, if I am rightly inform'd) hath invalidated our Orders; taking for granted, that our Bishops and Priests derive their Orders from the Church of *Rome*, there being no other Priesthood in *England* when the Reformation began, but the *Roman*. My Author appeals to all Chronicles, Histories, Mass-Books, both *Roman* and *English* in those Days, if that was not a sacrificing Priesthood; and every Priest, both *Roman* and *English* in those Days, was made by these words of the Bishop, *Receive thou a Power to offer Sacrifice as well for the Living as the Dead*. This Priesthood Protestants would not retain, and therefore devis'd other Words of Ordination.

nation: And thus not continuing in the Growth of Reformation, the Priesthood, and the Words of Ordination importing *sacrificing Power*, which was before the Reformation, they lost it. Pray, Sir, favour me so far as to give me a satisfactory Answer to this Query, and for the Future I shall cease to trouble you, unless any thing extraordinary intervene, and then I hope you will not deny your Assistance to

Your Friend and Servant.

MADAM, February 20. 1707.

I Am glad to find by your Letter of the 17th, that your Ladyship intends to peruse those Books you gave me occasion to mention in my last, and in this you will find I must refer you to more. Your Ladyship's arguing from 2 *Cór.* xli. 14. where the Apostle tells the *Corinthians*, that he desires not them to spend their Money or Goods on him, but that he would gladly spend all he had on them, as Parents are wont to do on their Children, and not Children on their Parents; would be a better Argument for the People to prove, that they should not provide for their Priests, but their Priests for them, if any had a mind, for his Diversion, so to argue from that Text. But to misapply it as your Ladyship hath been taught to do, to prove, without any limitation, that the Church of *Rome* ought to be our Guide now, because formerly she was our Parent, is an Inconsequence, or if you please, a Consequence which when turn'd upon the Church of *Rome*, I believe our Adversaries will not grant. For the Church of *Rome*, Madam, to use your Expression, deriv'd her Orders with her Christianity most certainly from the Church of *Jerusalem*, which was the *Mother of all Churches*, as much as *Eve* was of Mankind; and yet the *Romish* Clergy will not grant from thence, that those of

D

their

their Church should have the Church or Clergy of *Jerusalem* for their Guides, tho' one should urge the 2 *Cor.* xii. 14. never so much unto them. But I suppose it was the intention of your Ladyship, by using this Argument to object, that we have left the Church of *Rome*, tho' we had our Orders from her. To which I answer; We had the Scriptures of the Old Testament, the Law and the Prophets, yea, and our Lord himself from the *Jews*; and yet we have all departed entirely from them ever since the Time of the Apostles, who turned from them unto the *Gentiles*. I use this instance only for illustration, to shew your Ladyship, that our having our first Orders from the Church of *Rome* doth not indispensably tie us to them, or oblige us now to take that Church for our Guide; tho' it were true that we ought our Christianity solely to her, as I am sure we do not. Your Ladyship will make no difficulty to grant, that we are not to take our Parents right or wrong, for our Guides, tho', under God, we owe our Being to them. We are not to take them for our Guides when they would lead us out of the Way, when they would lead us into New and dangerous By-paths; or to speak more properly to the purpose, when they would mislead us from Right to Wrong, and from Truth to Error.

This, *Madam*, is our Case with respect to the Church of *Rome*; we left them because they mislead us; we left them because we would not follow them in the Wrong; we left them because we perceived they would lead us out of the Catholick Paths to our Destruction; and because that Church which once, as many others, had been a true Guide for several Ages, afterwards became a false one. In short, *Madam*, we left her not in any thing wherein she was safe and right, but only where she is dangerous, and in the Wrong; and we have departed no farther from her, than she hath departed from the Primitive Catholick Church.

Thus

Thus far, *Madam*, in Answer to your Argument drawn from 2 Cor. xii. 14. But your main Argument is taken from this, That though we derive our Orders from the Church of *Rome*, and that there was no other Priesthood in *England* at the Reformation but the *Roman*, which was a *sacrificing Priesthood*, the Priests being then made by these words, *Receive thou a Power to offer Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead*, yet we have left out that Form of Words ever since the Reformation, and devised others instead of them, and that therefore we have lost our true Ordinations with those Words, and by consequence that our Orders are Unlawful, and Null ever since the Reformation. I think, *Madam*, I have put your Objection in its true Light and full Force; and in Answer to it, give me leave to condole your *Ladyship's* Case, who have put your self into the Hands of such Men, as thus abuse your Credulity, and misguide you with an Argument which unchurches all the Churches, and Invalidates and Nulls all the Orders of the Christian World: For, believe me, *Madam*, that Form of Words was never us'd in *Christendom* for above a Thousand Years from Christ. It was not us'd in the Church of *Rome* it self when Pope *Gregory the Great* sent *Augustin the Monk* to convert the *English Saxons* eleven Hundred Years ago: Neither *St. Augustin*, nor *St. Gregory* himself were made Priests with that Form of Words; nor do the *Greek* or any of the Oriental Churches use it, or the Ceremony that attends it, in their Ordination of Priests to this Day. But, *Madam*, why do I say believe me? Believe one of the most learned and zealous Writers of the *Roman* Church, who hath many Years since prov'd all this in a Latin Book, Intituled, *COMMENTARIUS de Sacris ECCLESIAE ORDINATIONIBUS*, printed at *Paris*, 1655. None of the Priests of the *Roman* Church can, or dare deny this, or will undertake to dis-

prove this Author, who hath shewed at large what I have asserted in short. But if any of them are so hardy as to deny it, tell them I refer them to the Author's Preface before the *Ordinals* of the *Latin* or *Roman Church*, p. 257; to what he writes *de Sacris Ordinationibus*, pars III. p. 8. 17; And to *Exercitatio 7. de Presbyteratus Materia & Forma*, p. 129. Desire any of them to turn the Passages I have here referred to into *Englisb*, and then your *Ladyship* will find what a frivolous Objection they have proposed to you. An Objection, *Madam*, which hath been answer'd, and confuted again and again since the Reformation, particularly in Two Tracts, whereof the one was Re-printed at *London* for *R. Chiswell* at the *Rose and Crown* in *St. Paul's Church-Yard*, 1688. with this Title, *A Vindication of the Ordinations of the Church of England, &c.* The other was printed at *London* for *Brabazon Aylmer*, 1688. with this Title, *The Validity of the Orders of the Church of England, &c.* by *Humphrey Prideaux*, D. D. To these Books, *Madam*, I refer your *Ladyship*, and hope you will patiently and conscientiously peruse them without byass, and with a Mind entirely disposed to submit to Truth.

I forgot to tell your *Ladyship* the Name of the Author of the Latin Book mentioned above; it is *JOHANNES MORINUS*, a Name well known to all learned Divines

MADAM, I am

Your Ladyship's most

faithful, humble Servant

Geo. Hickes.

Four Months after the Date of this Letter I sent the next to her *Ladyship*, in which I desired to know whether she had received any Satisfaction
from

from my Letter, or the Books mentioned in it, as to the Objection she made against the Validity of our Ordinations.

MADAM, June 22. 1708.

IN the last Letter I received from your Ladyship, dated *February* 17. you promis'd me to peruse the Books I recommended to your reading. I hoped to have heard from your Ladyship whether or no you had received Satisfaction from them; in particular, whether the Letter I sent you in Answer to your Objection against the *Validity of our Ordinations*, and the Two Books upon that Subject, to which I directed your Ladyship, had given you Satisfaction. The Correspondence I have had with your Ladyship will justify, at least excuse this Enquiry; and if you please to let me know, whether you have been satisfy'd in part, or in whole, or not at all, that our Ordinations are valid, you'll very much oblige,

MADAM,

Your Ladyship's most

faithful, humble Servant,

Geo. Hickes.

The ANSWER.

HONOURED SIR,

July 15. 1708.

I Acknowledge the Obligation of your Concern for me, and thank you for all Favours, particularly that of your last; in Answer to which I have not yet seen the Answer to *Nubes Testium*. As to the Validity of the Ordination of the Church of *England* (of which I still continue a Member

hoping I may find my self safe therein) much more is owing, in my Opinion, to your own Arguments ; then the Answer to Mr. Slater of Putney, which I look upon to be more of Railing, than Proof or fair disputing. I shall be glad of the favour of your Correspondence, and if you recommend any Book more to confirm me of the Truth and Safety of our present Religion ; and whereby I might the better be able to put to silence Gainsayers, I will be at the Pains to purchase and peruse it : But in truth, that which gave me the first and greatest Prejudices against the Protestant Religion, was the late unjustifiable practises the Members of that Church have taken up ; and such, as I believe, you will not patronize, yet call for somewhat to be said in their Defence, or ought utterly to be abandon'd, till which I utterly despair of Peace or seeing good Days ; yet hope that those, who have no hand in any thing contrary to the Rules of the Gospel, will find favour with God,

I am, SIR,

with all due Respect, your

sincere Friend and Servant.

MADAM,

August 10. 1708.

I Receiv'd your Ladyship's Letter of July 15. and am glad to understand by it that you still continue a Member of the Church of *England*, and that my Answer to the Objections you sent me against our Orders to prove them Null and Invalid, were in any degree satisfactory to your Ladyship. I am very willing to hold as much Correspondence with your *Ladyship* as my constant Writing upon other Matters, and a broken Constitution will permit ; and will send your *Ladyship* two Books, according

according to your desire, to help you to silence all Gainfayers of the Church of *Rome* against the Church of *England*, in hopes you will diligently peruse them; and therefore desire to know by what way I may send them to you. In the mean time, *Madam*, give me leave to ask you, why you will still hearken to Gainfayers? And to beseech you to consider, if it is not too much Presumption in you, to trust your self alone with those, who bring you Objections, which are too hard for you to Answer, as being not qualified for Controversy, and to solve the Fallacies with which they perplex you. In truth, *Madam*, I think you bring your self into Temptation by this presumptuous Practice, and may provoke God justly to leave you to your own Weakness, as if you should hearken to all the Arguments that *Jews* are wont to bring against the Christian Religion, or *Arians* and *Socinians* against the Trinity and Divinity of Christ our Lord. Both which I am sure are able to puzzle you, as having more plausible Arguments for their Opinions, than Papists have for their Church against the Church of *England*, against which you have entertain'd so many Objections, all of them false, frivolous or fallacious: And if your *Ladyship* continue in this practice you will always be unsettled and dissatisfied, tho' God in Mercy should not leave you to go over to the Church of *Rome*, which of all others is the most corrupt in Faith, Worship, and Government, and most remote from the Doctrine and Practice of the ancient Catholick, and Apostolick Church. Would your *Ladyship*, presuming upon your own Strength, trust your self alone in the daily Conversation of *Deists*, who bring Arguments against all revealed Religion, and dispute in many respects against Christianity, as Popish Priests do against the Reformed Religion, and with as much Art and Malice too? Pray, good *Madam*, consider this, and

then think how unsafe it is for you by your self to be always lending a ready Ear to the Sophisms, Fallacies, false Charges and Misrepresentations of the Church of *England*, which your Popish Acquaintance, if you allow them, will still be ringing in your Ears. Your *Ladyship* may remember what you told me stuck with you in those Passages of my Book, concerning the Novelty of the *Romish* Religion, and the Challenge Sir *Humphry Linde* made to the Papists, and I after his Example, to shew Antiquity, Universality and Succession for their *Trent-Doctrines*. To this Challenge you gave me a Paper call'd an Answer; to which I have now made a Reply, and intend shortly to publish it, to shew the World as well as your *Ladyship*, how like Sophisters the Popish Writers argue, when they would make us believe that the Church of *Rome*, and the Churches in Communion with her, are exclusively of all others the Holy Catholick Universal Church, out of which Salvation is not to be had.

As to your first Prejudice, that you mention of the Church of *England* from the late Practices of the Members of it, which you think unjustifiable, I must pray your *Ladyship* to consider, First, that those Practices, let them be as unjustifiable as you can think, are no more an Argument against the Church of *England* than the general Apostacy of the *Jews*, in the Time of *Ahab*, was against the *Jewish* Church, or the general Apostacy of Christians from the Faith in the Reigns of the Emperors *Constantius* and *Valens* was against the Catholick Church of those Times. Secondly, I pray your *Ladyship* to consider, that the *Roman* Catholicks have in all Nations been highly guilty of the same, which you call unjustifiable Practices; the Popes themselves, particularly *Innocent XI.* not excepted. This *Pope* with the *Emperor*, as the *Roman* Catholicks cannot

cannot deny, was in the Confederacy, which brought about *the Revolution*, though our King at that Time was a zealous Profelyte, and Son of the Church of *Rome*. Thirdly, I must entreat you to consider, that the generality of the *Roman* Catholicks in these Kingdoms now do the same things, which you think unjustifiable in Protestants, and for which you have taken up a Prejudice against the Church of *England*. Fourthly, I beseech you to consider, if it is not more reasonable for you to take up a Prejudice against the Church of *Rome* upon the score of her Doctrines, which too much favour and patronize those, which you mean by unjustifiable Practices, than against the Church of *England*, which condemns them as sinful and unlawful; tho' you think her Members have acted contrary to those Doctrines, and in transgressing them have been her disobedient Sons. In the fifth place, *Madam*, let me suggest to your Ladyship how unreasonable, as well as dangerous it is, to take a Prejudice against any Church, for the unjustifiable Practices of any number of her Priests or People, who act against her Doctrines and Principles, and their own Profession. For by the same reason, *Madam*, you may be tempted to take a Prejudice against all Churches, and be offended at Christianity it self, because Christians every where in great numbers do not live like Christians, but are guilty of most unjustifiable Practices, contrary to the Doctrines and Principles of the Christian Religion, I mean of Christ and the Apostles, and the strict Practice of the first, and purest Ages of the Christian Church. In the last place, *Madam*, you cannot but know that there is a Remnant of the Clergy and People, in *Great-Britain*, who are not guilty of the Practices you mean; and if you think them in the right, you should for their sakes, lay down the Prejudice you have taken up against the Church upon the account of those, who you judge to have acted in certain Cases, as you think

think they should not have done. I have now no more to add, but to pray your Ladyship to consider of all that is here written to you by

Your Ladyship's Humble Servant

Geo. Hickes.

SIR,

September 1. 1708.

I Return thanks for the Favour of yours, begging Pardon for not answering it sooner; the Books you were pleased to mention I shall set a value on: And would you favour me so far as to send them to Mr. P—'s House, or to my Son, Sir at Mr. M— House in G—S—, near the School, he will take care to convey them to me. With my due acknowledgment of all your Civilities I remain

Your assured Friend and Servant.

MADAM,

September 22. 1708.

HAD it not been for many Avocations and much Illness since I received your Ladyship's Letter, you had sooner received this little Book, which having been long out of Print, I had it not out of the Shops, but from a private Hand, which I tell you, to excuse the homely Dress in which I send it to your Ladyship. If you are not already reconciled to the Church of *Rome*, or determined to go to it, I hope, by God's Blessing, it will give you satisfaction; but if you are gone, or going over to that, and still look to receive more and more Objections against the Church of *England*, it will be to no purpose for me to have farther Correspondence with you; and therefore I pray you to let me know which of the Churches you are now of, and to which you resolve finally to adhere. In my last Letter

Letter I answered the Objections of your last, but one; but in your last Letter you took no notice of my Answer, but only acknowledged the Receipt of it, which discourages me from writing any more to you; and I pray you your self to judge, if I had not reason to expect from your *Ladyship* an account of what effect my Answer to one of your Objections especially had upon you; I mean that which you said gave you the first Offence against the Church of *England*. Pray, *Madam*, be pleased to write your mind plainly to me, and you'll thereby very much oblige

Your *Ladyship's*

most obedient Servant

Geo. Hickes.

SIR,

October 9. 1708.

I Have the Favour of yours with the Book, for which I return you my Thanks, notwithstanding I had one of the same long since by me, and made use of it as an Argument to convince Gain-sayers; but pardon me if I tell you their Reply, viz. that in short it was nothing but a bundle of Lies: However, I am otherwise satisfied of the Truth of a great part of it, and am the more confirm'd by your good Opinion of it: And your prevalent Arguments in your former Letter, to which I thought I had given so satisfactory an Answer, as had left you no room to doubt of my continuance in the Communion of the Church of *England*; but if that were defective, I here will let you know I received the Holy Communion in this our Church of *England* last Sunday, which, I hope, will confirm you that I am still a Member of it: Which, if a Blessing, I acknowledge it in a great measure

measure owing to you, and shall always think myself happy in your good Correspondence, which I beg a continuance of, and by which you will oblige

Your Friend and Servant,

M A D A M,

St. Andrew. 1708.

I Have not been in good Health since I received your Ladyship's Letter of *October* the 9th, and for the last Month have been very ill of a Feaver and Strangury, and am not yet well able to write with my own Hand. In your Letter you tell me, that the *Gainsayers* reply, that the little Book I sent you is a bundle of Lies, which yet they have not prov'd, tho' the Book hath been published almost these *Thirty Years*. Their saying that it is a bundle of Lies, is, in my Judgment, a Presumption that they think it not capable of a fair and satisfactory Answer.

Your Ladyship knows I have dealt with you as becomes me, with great Plainness and Sincerity, therefore you must give me leave to tell you, that your last Letter hath not given me the satisfaction I desire, of your continuance in the Communion of the Church of *England*. Because the *Gainsayers*, with whom you converse, think *theirs* the true Church of *England*, and therefore your saying that you received the Holy Communion in this our Church of *England* last Sunday, may have a double Sense, especially when I consider your following words: Which, if a Blessing, I acknowledge it in a great measure owing to you. Which last words are also of doubtful signification to me, who have known some, and have heard of others converted to the Church of *Rome*, who are wont to say they ow'd the blessing of their Conversion (as they call'd it) to such and such Ministers of the Church of *England*, from whom they could not receive satisfaction.

Where-

Wherefore it had been much more satisfactory to me, if your Ladyship had said, *I received the Holy Communion in our Parish Church, of our Parish Minister, last Sunday; for which Blessing I acknowledge my self in a great measure, under God, obliged to you.* If your Ladyship please to assure me, that, by the Grace of God, you still continue in the Faith and Communion of the Reform'd Church of England, as by Law establish'd since the Reformation; and that you neither are, nor are resolv'd to be reconciled to the Church of Rome, it will be perfect Satisfaction, and a great Comfort to

Your Ladyship's most faithful

and obedient Servant

Geo. Hickes:

A R E

Wherefore it had been much more satisfactory
 to have seen the Author's Answer to the
 Parish Minister, last Sunday; for which Blessing I am
 obliged to you. If your Ladyship please to assure
 me, that by the Grace of God, you will continue
 in the Faith and Communion of the Reformed
 Church of England, as by Law established;
 and that you will not be reconciled to the Church of
 Rome, it will be a great Satisfaction, and a great
 Comfort to me.

REPLY

TO THE

PAPER

INSCRIBED,

That the Doctrines declared, &c. in Answer to some Passages in Dr. George Hickes's Book.

THE Passages of Dr. *Hickes's* * Book, to which the first Part of this Paper pretends to be an Answer, are contained in four Leaves of it, from p. 188 to p. 197. And to shew the Sophistry of this pretended Answer to them, it will be expedient to observe the several senses of the word FAITH, which hath a General, Special, and *most* Special Signification. In the *general* signification it is taken for all Divine Revelations, or all Verities, be they Doctrines or Facts, which

* Entituled, *Several Letters which passed between Dr. George Hickes and a Popish Priest.* London, Printed for Richard Sare at Grays-Inn-Gate in Holbourn. 1705.

are to be believed, because they are revealed. But in the *special* signification it is taken only for those Verities of Doctrine, or Fact, which are revealed, because they are to be believed. We are to believe the first sort of Verities, when we happen to know them, or upon supposition that we know them to be revealed; but we are bound to know and learn the latter, that we may believe them, and therefore they are necessarily to be taught and proposed to the Belief of Christians, and to be professed by them, which the other are not. A Christian may be safely ignorant of the first sort of Revelations, and after he knows them is not bound to remember them, but he must not be ignorant of the Second sort, because he cannot be a Christian till he knows them and professes them; and he is bound to profess them, and by consequence to remember them all the Days of his Life. In short, the first sort of Revelations are not simply and absolutely necessary to be believed, nor sufficient for Salvation to them, who believe them; but the latter are simply and absolutely to be believed, and sufficient for Salvation to all those who truly believe and practise them; and in truth are meant by that Faith which St. Jude saith *was once deliver'd to the Saints*. Now these revealed Doctrines or Traditions of the latter sort, which are necessary to be believed, and sufficient for Salvation to all those, who truly believe and practise them, are Twofold, as the words Believe and Practise import, Speculative and Practical. By Speculative I mean such as are called the *Credenda* of the Christian Religion, as being Points of mere Belief, of which the Creed, commonly called the *Apostle's Creed* is a sufficient Summary. By Practical, I mean such as are called the *Agenda* of the Christian Religion, which are to be practised as well as believed, as consisting of Divine Precepts for Ritual, or Moral Obedience; but of these practical re-
vealed

vealed Doctrines the Church never had any Summary for Christian Profession, as of the former, which therefore came in the most special Sense to be called Doctrines or Points, or Matters of Faith, *i. e.* of mere Faith, or simple Belief. And from thence it was that the word *Faith* came to be used in the *most special Sense*, for the speculative Doctrines of pure Belief, as they are distinguished from the Ritual and Moral Doctrines of Christian Practice, which are necessary to Salvation, and which together with the Speculative Doctrines of mere Belief, were once delivered to the Saints by the Apostles: And what I demanded of my Adversary, and now demand of the Writer of this Paper is to shew, That the *Trent-Doctrines*, which the *Roman Church* teaches and requires to be believed, as necessary to Salvation, were proposed or delivered by the Apostles to the Catholic Church, as Doctrines of Faith in the *Special* or *most Special Sense*, which Christians were bound to know, believe, and practise; and that they were constantly taught and receiv'd as such in all Churches from Age to Age, to the time of the Council of *Trent*. Nay, in my *Letters* I challenged my Adversary in his own words, to name any Bishops, Writers, Councils, Churches, or any one single Congregation or Village of Christians for the first six Hundred Years, that professed the *Romish Religion* as it differs from ours, or that their additional Doctrines, or Articles to the old Creed were contained, or involved in any of the Prime Principles or Articles of the Christian Faith, as professed in any Form for the first six Centuries, or were clearly deducible from them, as conclusions from their Premises, or that there was such a Connexion of the New with the Old Articles, as Logick required between the Antecedents and their just Consequents, or that the New Creed of *Pius IV.* had, as *Vincentius Lirinensis* speaks, the Limbs and Parts of the Old Creed

Creed, and differ'd no more from it but in Growth, and Stature, as a Man doth from a Boy.

The same Challenges I make to the Author of this Paper: Nay I challenge him to shew, that Christ or his Apostles, had any Notion of the ^a Doctrines in the Margent, I mean that they knew them to be Christian Doctrines, much less that they taught them, or proposed them to the *Saints* as necessary to Salvation. And having premised this let us see how miserably he answers those

^a I do also profess, that in the Mass there is offered a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice for the Quick and the Dead, and that in the most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially the Body and Blood, together with the Soul, and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is a Change made of the whole Substance of Bread into the Body, and of the whole Substance of Wine into the Blood, which Change the Catholick Church calls Transubstantiation. I confess also that under one kind only, whole, and entire Christ, and a true Sacrament is taken, and received. I do firmly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the Souls there detained are relieved by the Suffrages of the Faithful. I do likewise believe that the Spirits reigning together with Christ are to be worshipped and prayed unto, and that they do offer Prayers unto God for us, and that their Relicks are to be had in Veneration. I do most firmly assert, that the Images of Christ, and of the ever Virgin Mother of God, and of the other Saints ought to be had and retained; and that due Honour and Veneration ought to be given to them. I do acknowledge the Holy Catholick Apostolick Roman Church to be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, and I do promise, and swear true Obedience to the Bishop of Rome, the Successor of St. Peter, the Prime of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ. I do also without the least doubt receive, and profess all other things which have been delivered, defined, and declared by the Sacred Canons and Oecumencial Councils, and especially by the holy Synod of Trent. And all things contrary thereunto, and all Heresies whatsoever condemn'd, reject'd, and anathematized by the Church, I do likewise condemn, reject, and anathematize. This true Catholick Faith, without which no Man can be saved; which at this time I freely profess, and truly embrace. I will be careful (by the help of God) that the same be retained, and firmly professed whole and inviolate; and that as much as in me lies, it be held, taught, and preached by those under my Power, and by such as I shall have charge over in my Profession. I—A— Promise, Vow, and Swear the same, so help me God, and these his holy Gospels.

Challenges : Let us examine the Fallacies of his Paper, and observe by what Arts he would impose upon the good Lady's Understanding, in his *No-answer* to the forementioned Passages of my Book.

The Title is; *That the Doctrines declared by the Council of Trent to be de Fide, are ancient, &c.* Here lurks a Fallacy in the ambiguity of the word *Ancient* : Which may either signify Doctrines of *Primary Antiquity* which were taught, and proposed by the Apostles as Doctrines of Faith, or Doctrines of a *Secondary Antiquity*, which were never taught or proposed to the Church by the Apostles, or delivered by their Scholars or next Successors as Apostolick Doctrines, and Traditions, but sprung up like Tares some at one time, and some at another in after Ages of the Church. If our Author means, that the additional Doctrines, *de Fide*, in the Creed of *Pius IV.* are ancient in the Secondary Sense, that no Protestant Writer ever denied ; for there is a *Vetus Erroris*, an *Antiquity of Error*, as the ancient Fathers long since observed : And Antiquity in this Sense is no mark of Truth, or Argument for it, much less a Proof that Doctrines are Doctrines of Faith, without which no Man can be saved. To prove this it must be shewn, that they were Doctrines of Faith in the *special Sense* of the Word from the Beginning, or Doctrines of Apostolical Original, preached as Doctrines of Faith by the Apostles, or by the Doctors, and Evangelists sent by them to the Primitive Church. This is that which the Writer of the Paper was to prove ; and how he has proved it, that is, made no proof of it, will be seen from what follows.

We are taught, saith he, to contend for the Faith once delivered to the Saints. True, good Sir, and in contending for that Faith, we are to contend for the Purity and Integrity of it, we are to contend

tend for it against all Innovations, Mixtures, and Additions, and are to oppose all Doctrines, tho' never so ancient, as Doctrines *de Fide*, which were no part of that Faith.

Let me ask who were those Saints? Most certainly it was, that body of Men signify'd by the 9th Article of the Creed, the Holy Catholick Church. Yes, Sir, it was the whole body of Christians consisting of Clergy, and Laity, or the Holy Catholick Church, of which the Church of *Rome* was then esteemed but a part, as the Churches of *Hierusalem* and *Antioch* were, to which the Faith was delivered by the Apostles, and Evangelists, and was to be deliver'd on to all succeeding Christians and Churches planted in after Ages by their Successors: And your Business was to prove, that the *Trent-Doctrines* in Dispute between us were part of that Primitive Faith. But not being able to prove this, you explain the *Saints*, or whole body of Christians by the *Holy Catholick Church*; by which in this Paper, and your *Vindication* of it, you most precariously understand the Church of *Rome*, as if she only in virtue of her Catholicism, which she takes unto her self, were the depositary of the Faith, and sole Judge not only of what Doctrines are true and what false, but of what are to be believed as Points of Faith, and what are not. But, Sir, the whole body of Christians neither is, nor ever was called or esteemed the Church of *Rome*, nor ever was the *Diocesan*, or *Urbicarian*, or *Patriarchal* Church of *Rome*, take it in which Sense you will, esteemed the whole Body of Christians. Nor did the Church of *Rome* so called, more than any other Church, infuse Catholick Unity, or Universality into all other Churches, as your Writers are wont to prattle; pardon the Expression, and as it is your design to make the Lady believe it doth, and that no other Churches can be Catholick but by *participation*, or by Agreement in Faith and Communion with it. This

false as well as precarious Notion, I found the good Lady had imbib'd from you, and therefore it is that you'd keep such a jingle throughout your Paper, and the *Vindication* of it with the *Holy Catholick Church*, still meaning the Church of Rome, and the Churches in subjection to her spiritual Sovereignty, exclusive of all others, though they be never so Orthodox, and profess and contend for that very Faith, which was once delivered to the Saints.

Now for the sake of the good Lady, and to convince her of the Vanity and Arrogance of these Pretensions of the Church of Rome, I will let her see how they spoke of the Church of Christ in the Primitive Times out of *Tertullian's* Book of his Prescription against Hereticks, wherein he writes in this manner. ^a *The Apostles, saith he, having received the promised Power of the Holy Ghost to work Miracles, and to speak with Tongues, first attested the Faith in Jesus Christ throughout Judæa; and having planted Churches there, they then went out into the World, and preached the same Doctrine of the very same Faith to the Heathen Nations, and founded Churches in several Cities; from which the rest of the Churches borrowed the Tradition of the Faith and the Seeds of [Christian] Doctrine; and new Churches still daily borrowed them that they may become Churches, and so they are reputed Apostolick, as being the Off-spring of the Apostolick Churches. For things of every kind must be fetch'd from their Original. Wherefore as many, and famous as the Churches are, they came from that one Church which the Apostles first planted, and so may be all called first, and all Apostolical Churches, while they are all united in a peaceful Communion, brotherly Love, and the same rights of Hospitality one with another; which nothing can regulate and preserve, but*

^a Cap. 20.

the Tradition of one and the same Faith. So in another place; ^a But if any of these Hereticks dare pretend to Apostolical Antiquity, that they may seem to come from the Apostles, because they were in their time; then say we, let them shew the Original of their Churches, let them give us a Catalogue of their Bishops in an orderly Succession to one another, and shew that their first Bishop had for his Predecessor some Apostle, or Apostolick Man, who continued firm and constant to the Apostles. For this tryal the Apostolical Churches will undergo: As for Example, the Church of Smyrna can shew her Polycarp, placed there by St. John, as the Church of the Romans doth Clement, ordained by St. Peter. In like manner the rest of the Churches have those to shew, who were made their Bishops by Succession from the Apostles. Let the Hereticks say this of themselves if they can: For after so much blasphemy they need stick at nothing. But in truth their Doctrine compared with that of the Apostles, will shew by its difference from it, and contradiction to it, that it did not come from any Apostle, or Apostolick Man. For as the Apostles taught nothing different from one another, so neither did the Apostolick Men publish any thing contrary to what the Apostles taught, or preached otherwise than as they learned from the Apostles. After this manner ought all those later Churches to be tried, which have been founded since the Apostles, and are still daily founded, though not by an Apostle, or Apostolick Man. For if they agree in the Profession of the same Faith, they are to be accounted no less Apostolick than the Churches planted by the Apostles, because of their affinity in Doctrine. After this manner their own Churches challenge the Hereticks to prove themselves either way to be Apostolick. But they are far from being such, nor can they prove themselves to be what they are not; nor are they received into Peace and Communion by any of the Churches,

that are in either respect Apostolick. For in truth they cannot be Apostolick, because of the ² difference as to the Faith between them and the Apostolick Churches.

To the same purpose in ^b another place: Survey the Apostolick Churches, in which Bishops preside in the Thrones of the Apostles, and in which the very Authentick or original Epistles of the Apostles are read, expressing the Voice, and representing the Person of every one of them. If Achaia be near thee, there thou hast the Church of Corinth. If thou art not far from Macedonia, there thou hast the Churches of Philippi and Thessalonica. If thou wilt go into Asia, there thou hast the Church of Ephesus. But if thou livest near Italy, there thou hast the Church of Rome, from whence we of Africa derive our Mission. O blessed Church! upon which the Apostles poured out all their Doctrine with their Blood; where Peter suffered upon the Cross, as our Lord did; where Paul was beheaded, as John Baptist was, and received the same Crown of Martyrdom; where John the Apostle, when he was plunged into boiling Oil came out without harm, and was banished into Patmos. Let us see what she received, and what she hath taught; for she also is in Communion with our African Churches. She knows but one God, Creator of the Universe, and Christ Jesus the Son of God the Creator, born of the Virgin Mary, and the Resurrection of the Body. She receives the Law and the Prophets, with the Writings of the Evangelists, and Apostles; and from them she imbibes the Faith, which she signs in Baptism and clothes with the white Robe of the Holy Spirit, and feeds with the Holy Eucharist. She exhorts to Martyrdom, and receives no body who holds any thing against this Institution. — If these things be so, the Truth must be on our side, who

^a Ob diversitatem Sacramenti nullo modo Apostolicæ. Recte intelligit Macerius de Sacramento fidei in Baptismo. Pamel in Annot.

^b Cap. 26.

walk by the same Rule, that which the Church received from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, and Christ from God.

From these Passages, Sir, it is easy to make a Comment on the Words of St. Jude, which you have chosen for the Text of your Answer to my Challenge. *First*, Then the Persons who delivered the Faith, for which we are to contend, were the Apostles, and Apostolick Men, whom the Apostles sent out to preach that Faith, and plant Churches over the World. *Secondly*, The Saints to whom they delivered it, were the Christians of those Churches which they planted in every place; *First*, Among the Jews and Samaritans in the Holy-Land, and then among the Gentiles in Syria, Asia, Greece and Italy; as at Antioch, Smyrna, Ephesus, Corinth, and Rome, which were all equally esteemed Apostolick Churches. *Secondly*, From these Churches were daily propagated other Churches, which were reputed Apostolick, because they were the Off-spring of Apostolick Churches. And from these again were propagated others, which were accounted no less Apostolick than the Churches planted by the Apostles, because of their Agreement in Doctrine, and Profession of the same Faith with the Apostolick Churches; and so are all Churches, which are still daily founded, to be called and esteemed Apostolick, though not founded like the Churches above mentioned by an Apostle, or Apostolick Man. *Thirdly*, All the several Churches, when Tertullian wrote in the next Age to the Apostles, were esteemed as Apostolick and integral Parts of the Catholick Church without any relation to, or dependance upon the Church of Rome. *Fourthly*, The Catholick Church was then made up of all the Apostolick Churches, not by virtue of any special Union with, and under the Church of Rome, but by a mutual co-ordinate Union in the same Faith, and Communion, and brotherly

therly Charity with another. * *Catholick* in that Age primarily signified *Universal*; but then because all particular Churches which made up the *Catholic*, or *Universal*, had one and the same Faith and Discipline, and every Part professed what the Whole, and the Whole what every Part did; therefore *Catholic* came to signify *Pure*, *Sound* and *Apostolical*, and was attributed to all faithful Churches, as well as to the Church of *Rome*. This, *Sir*, you know I have shew'd against my Adversary, whose Defence you have undertook, in my Book, intituled, *Several Letters*, &c. I say *Catholic*, from signifying *Universal*, came to be taken for *Pure*, *Sound*, and *Apostolical*; and was in this sense given as an honourable Title to all faithful Churches. But then, *Sir*, I must tell you, that as more modern Churches founded in later Times, were accounted no less *Apostolick* than the Churches planted by the Apostles upon the score of the *Apostolick Faith*; so by the same Rule, the most ancient Churches are no longer to be called, or accounted *Apostolick*, and *Catholic*, than they keep to that Faith without Innovations, Mixtures, and Additions; and Teaching for Doctrines of God the Traditions and Inventions of Men, as your Church hath done. This, *Sir*, I have said not only to shew the Impropriety, and Arrogance of calling your Church *Catholic*, as *Catholic* signifies *Universal*; but to detect her Injustice, as well as the Injustice of her Writers in calling her Catho-

* Quamquam & si quosdam inter Domesticos, ut ita dixerim, differebant, non tamen ea fuisse credendum est, quæ aliam fidei regulam superducerent diversam, & contrariam illi quam CATHOLICÆ in medium proferebant, *Tert. de Præscript. c. 26.* Nam constat illos, neque adeo olim fuisse Antonini fere principatu & in *Catholica* primo doctrinam credidisse apud Ecclesiam Romanensem, *ibid. c. 30.* So in his Book against Marcion, c. 22. He calls the Christian Church planted in its several Members through the World, *Catholicam Hierusalem.*

lick, as Catholick signifies *Pure, Sound and Apostolical*, because she hath alter'd the Apostolick Faith which they delivered to the Churches, by adding strange Doctrines to it; and particularly that of her being *the Mother and Mistress of all Churches*, and by consequence the Principle of Union to them, as the Head is to the Body; from whence throughout the Council of *Trent*, she presumes to call her self the *Catholick Church*; and her *Court-Writers*, among whom I reckon you, to call her, in exclusion of all other Churches, the *Holy Catholick*, and the *Holy Catholick, Apostolick*, nay, the *Holy Catholick, Apostolick, Universal Church*. These terms, *Sir*, you have bestowed plentifully upon her in your Answer to my Challenge, and the Defence of it; though *Tertullian*, where he sets himself to speak most magnificently of her, only reckons her among the Churches founded by the Apostles, but signalized above the rest in the Number and Quality of her Martyrs. But had he known her to be the Mistress and Head of all Churches, and the Principle of Union to them; had he known that it was she, which infused Unity and Catholicism into all the other Churches; and that they were only Catholick, as Members of her, he could never have omitted these Privileges, these Fundamental Doctrines of Christian Faith, and Communion; which to have mentioned had been ten times more for her Honour than the Martyrdom of *Peter*, and *Paul*, and of *St. John's* being cast into a Caldron of boiling Oil at *Rome*.

Here therefore, *Sir*, to use my Author's Phrase, I *prescribe* against your calling the Church of *Rome* the Catholick Church in any sense, or limiting the Catholick Church to her and the Churches in Communion with her, which now are but a Part, and the most *uncatholick, unapostolick* Part of the universal Church; which with new and pernicious Mixtures hath adulterated the old Faith, which
the

the Apostles, and Apostolick Men of their Mission once so delivered to the *Saints*.

For that Faith, you acknowledge, we are commanded to contend, as necessary to Salvation; and for that true Catholick Faith we contend against you, who have added to it new, doubtful, false, and impious Doctrines, to the destruction of Souls, and the dishonour of God and his Church. For that Primitive Faith once delivered to the Church by the Apostles, as necessary to Salvation, you acknowledge we are to contend; and yet in your very next words you assert, That every Doctrine of this Faith was never thought necessary to be known by every Christian. This, Sir, is very strange, that the whole Faith once delivered by the Apostles to the Church, ought to be contended for, as necessary to Salvation; and yet that some parts of it should not be necessary to be known by every Christian. *St. Jude, whom you cite, wrote to all the faithful Christians of his Time, and by consequence to every one of them concerning the common Salvation; and told them it was needful for him to write unto them, and exhort them that they should earnestly contend for the Faith [surely for the whole Faith, and all the Doctrines of it] once delivered to the Saints.* They were to contend for all the Doctrines of Faith, which the Apostles delivered to them, as necessary to Salvation: And you dare not deny but that the Apostles delivered all the Doctrines of the Christian Faith; and therefore every one of them was delivered, and necessary to be known by every Christian. The Doctrines of Faith which the Apostles preached, as necessary for Salvation, were Doctrines of Faith not in the general, but special Sense of the Word; not Doctrines which are accidentally to be believed as true, when we happen to know they are revealed; but Doctrines which were necessarily to be proposed and revealed on purpose that they might be

be believed: Doctrines, which the Apostles were bound, under the pain of Damnation, to preach, as well as the People to believe, simply necessary Truths essential to the Gospel, without knowing and believing of which a Man could not be a true Christian, nor a Society of Christians a true Church: And yet of the Doctrines of this Faith, you say, that every one of them was not necessary to be known by every Christian; but *when known* [that is, when they happened to be known] *was necessary to be believed.* Thus, Sir, you confound the plain, certain Doctrines of Faith, which the Apostles preached as necessary to Salvation, and as such are clearly revealed in the Scriptures with the dark, obscure, or uncertain Doctrines; which we are to believe only when we chance to come to the clear and certain knowledge of them; but are not absolutely necessary for the Christian Clergy to teach, or Christian People to know or believe. Nay, you confound them with the Historical, Chronological, Chorographical, and other circumstantial Truths of Scripture, which are not necessary to be known, but only to be believed as true, when they happen to be known; in virtue of this general Principle, *That all Divine Revelations are true*, and not upon the special account of being necessary to Salvation.

This will farther appear from your following words: *Wherefore there being this material difference among the Doctrines of Faith, that some are necessary to be known by every Christian, and others not.* The Apostles first, and after their Example, the Pastors of the Catholick Church in succeeding Ages gathered together Doctrines necessary to be known by all Men, into a certain Form called a C R E E D. Here you first confound the Doctrines of general and special Faith together, on purpose to deceive the Lady, and alter the state of the Controversy between you and us; which proceeds of Doctrines of

of Faith in the *special* Sense, that are necessary to be known, and believed in order to Salvation. For this Faith, say you above, we are commanded to contend as necessary to Salvation: And therefore to shew the inconsistency and sophistry of your last Period, and how you would shift the Question, I need but intersert your own words in this manner: *Wherefore there being this material difference among the Doctrines of Faith, (which are necessary to Salvation) that some are necessary to be known, and others not, &c.* which is as much as to say, *Wherefore there being this material difference among the Doctrines of Faith, which are necessary to Salvation, though some are necessary to it, and others are not, &c.* or if you please thus: *Wherefore there being this material difference among the necessary Doctrines of Faith, that some are necessary, and others not, &c.* Sir, do you not blush at this contradiction? Do you not blush at your own distinction of the Doctrines of Faith which you assert to be necessary, into *necessary* and *non-necessary*? Or rather are you not ashamed to confound the *general* and *special* Notion of Faith knowingly and wilfully, and in contradiction to your self, rather than not catch a well meaning Lady not used to Sophistry, by changing the state of the Question from Doctrines of Faith in the general, or large, to the Doctrines of Faith in the special, or stricter Sense of the Word. Certainly, Sir, the Apostles taught the World all the necessary Doctrines of Faith, whether only Speculative, or Speculative and Practical, they kept back none of them from the knowledge of the Saints, because they were absolutely necessary to be known, and believed: And therefore if your *Trent-Doctrines* are absolutely necessary to be known and believed, as you profess in the Creed of *Pius IV.* they were as necessary to be known then as now, and must have been taught by the Apostles, and retained in all Churches; which

which we deny, and challenge you to shew. You declare them to be part of the true Catholick Faith, without which no Man can be saved; and accordingly you promise, vow, and swear, to Preach and Teach them as such, and that you will endeavour they be retained, and firmly professed whole and inviolate: And yet we challenge you to shew they are a part of the Catholick Apostolick Faith once delivered to the Saints, or that they have Antiquity, Universality, and Succession, as they certainly would have had, as well as the old Doctrines of Faith *once deliver'd to the Saints*. You must pardon me, Sir, if I tell you you tempt me to think you are conscious to your self, that you could not answer my *Challenge*, and that therefore you used that fallacious distinction in contradiction to your self, as well as the Truth, between some Matters of Faith that are necessary to be known by every Christian, and others that are not. You have also couched another Fallacy in your foregoing Period, by confounding the Doctrines of Faith in the *special* Sense of the Word, with Doctrines of Faith in the *most special* and *strict* Sense of it; that is, in confounding *all* the Doctrines of Faith, that are necessary to Salvation with *some*; or the *whole* Faith which was once delivered to the Saints with *part* of it self contained in the Creed: For, say you, (I am forced to repeat your words again) *Wherefore there being this material difference among the Doctrines of Faith, that some are necessary to be known by every Christian, and others not; the Apostles first; and after their Example the Pastors of the Catholick Church in succeeding Ages gathered together Doctrines necessary to be known by all Men, into a certain Form called a Creed.* But, Sir, did they collect all the Doctrines which they taught as necessary to Salvation into the Creed, or did they teach no other as necessary to be

believed,

believed in order to Salvation, but those contained in it? I have already observed to you, that the Faith once delivered to the Saints consists of two sorts of Doctrines or Traditions, speculative and practical, commonly called in the Schools the *CREDENDA* and *AGENDA* of the Christian Religion; and that the *Creed* is but a Summary, though a sufficient Summary of the former, but that the Church never had a Summary of the latter; and by consequence that the *Creed*, as you afterwards say, were not composed to contain the whole Faith, or all the Doctrines of it, which were once delivered to the *Saints*. No, Sir, the whole Faith, you know very well, is contained in the *Scriptures*, and not in the *Creed*, which was never intended for an express Collection of all the Doctrines of Faith, but only of such as were sufficient to distinguish a Christian from a Pagan, or a Jew; or the Christian Religion from *Polytheism* on one hand, and *Judaism* on the other: And from the Heresies which arose in the Apostolick Age, particularly from those which in various Forms and Shapes of lying Doctrines, denied Jesus to be the Son of God, and Christ, and to have really come in the Flesh, but only in Appearance, as is manifest from the first Chapter of St. *John's* Gospel, and his first General Epistle. And therefore in answer to what follows in your Paper, I grant you that, *neither the Apostles, nor the Nicene Fathers, made it an Article of their Creed, that the whole Faith once delivered to the Saints, was contained therein.* But however the whole Christian Faith was delivered to the Saints, and by what was not expressed in the *Creed*, was, and is expressly contained in the *Scriptures* as the true Doctrine of the Holy Mysteries or Sacraments; and the Doctrine of Divine Grace, as you should have said, are of the Faith, though the *Creed* commonly called the *Apostle's-Creed*,
and

and the *Nicene-Creed*, say nothing of them. But then the Scriptures speak as expressly of them, and other Doctrines of Faith, as of the Doctrines mentioned in the *Creeds*; and the Apostles delivered them as to the Saints, and as Apostolick Doctrines or Traditions, they were retained, professed, and practised in all Churches, *ab omnibus, abique, & semper*, as you should have proved your additional *Trent-Articles* were. To shew that, is, and ever will be my *Challenge*; and therefore because you could not answer it, you impose upon her *Ladyship* with Sophisms and Fallacies, never telling her that the Doctrines of Faith, which are not mentioned in the Creed, are contained in the Scriptures.

I need say no more to shew the Vanity of your Paper. But that you, nor any of yours should think I passed over any part of it, because I could not answer it, I must run over the whole, Period after Period, upon which I shall make such Observations and Reflections, as they severally require.

After you had told the Lady that the *whole Faith*, once delivered to the *Saints*, was not contained in the *Creeds*, you prove it by instances: For example (say you) neither what a *Sacrament* is, nor the number of those *Sacraments* is expressed in those *Creeds*; and yet they are of the Faith once delivered to the *Saints*, though the two *Creeds* mentioned say nothing of them. To which in the first place let me Reply by the way, that there was no need that the *Creed*, or the Scriptures, should tell the *Saints* what a *Sacrament* was; for *Sacrament* in the religious Sense of the Word, signifies *Mystery*, and is used in the Latin Church to express the Greek word *Μυστήριον*: And both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, before they were converted to Christianity, knew what a religious *Mystery* was, and needed no definition or description thereof.

And

And then, as to the *number of Sacraments*, or religious Mysteries in the Christian Religion, neither the Scriptures nor the Creeds, differ in that; though the former mention all the things that are Mysteries, some in a larger, and some in a stricter Sense; particularly *Baptism* and the Holy Eucharist, which the Church in a most emphatical special Sense called of old τα ἅγια μυστήρια, the holy Mysteries; as being fœderal Mysteries, or Sacraments of greater dignity than the other Rites, which she called Mysteries in a larger and lower Sense. But to come to the purpose; you say the Sacraments, I pray to prevent Disputes, let me say the *two Sacraments*, in which we both agree, *were of the Faith once delivered to the Saints, though the Creeds say nothing of them*, and this you say truly: But then you should have told the *Lady* they were mentioned in the Writings of the New Testament, in which they were delivered by the Apostles to the Saints. Then you proceed to a second instance: *So also the Doctrines concerning Divine Grace pertain to the Faith once delivered to the Saints, though the two Creeds mentioned say nothing of them*. Sir, pray also to prevent Disputes foreign to the present Occasion, let me alter your Expression into the Singular Number, and say, *the Doctrine concerning Divine Grace*, or Assistance; for that I grant you pertains to the Faith, though several of the School-points concerning Divine Grace determined by the Council of *Trent*, pertain not to the Faith. But then the *Doctrine of Divine Grace*, as well as that of the two Sacraments is contained in the Scriptures, though they are not mentioned in the Creeds. Then you go on: *Wherefore these Creeds were not composed to contain the whole Faith, but so much of it as is necessary to be known by every Christian*. How, Sir, is no more of the Faith necessary to be known by every Christian, than that part of it which is expressed

expressed in the Creed? Can the whole be necessary to Salvation, as you acknowledge, and yet not necessary to be known and believed by every Christian? Or can any certain parts of it be necessary to be known by every Christian, upon any other account, than as all are, because they are all necessary to Salvation? You grant that we are to contend earnestly for the *whole Faith* once deliver'd to the Saints by the Apostles: And if we are to contend for the whole of it, how comes it to pass that now only part of it is necessary to be known by every Christian? Doth God oblige us to contend for what we do not, or need not know? Or was it needful for the *Saints*, to whom the Apostles preached the whole Faith, to know it *all*, and *every* Doctrine of it, and yet for the *Saints* of after Ages, only necessary to know some? But to proceed. *What*, say you, if *Errors* arise *destructive* to other Doctrines of Faith, which are not *expressed* in those Creeds, must the SAINTS to whom the Faith was *once delivered*, or their SUCCESSORS, sacrifice Divine Doctrines to Error, and not contend for them because they are not *expressed* in those Creeds, which we know neither do, nor ever were intended to contain the *whole Faith* once delivered to the Saints? Here again by the way, let me ask you, if we are not to contend for Doctrines of Faith, which being expressed in the Scriptures, are only couched, and implicitly contained in those Creeds. As for Example, The two Sacraments, in which the Saints hold Communion throughout the whole Catholick Church, are implicitly contained in the *Holy Catholick Church*, the *Communion of Saints*. So in the preceding Article of the *Holy Ghost* the Doctrine of Grace is implicitly contained, the *Holy Ghost* being set forth in the Scriptures as the Author and Efficient of all Divine Grace, Strength, and Assistance, or if you please of all Divine Graces; which

F there-

therefore are called the *Fruit of the Spirit*. So the Doctrine of Divine Providence plainly taught in the Scriptures, is implicitly contained in the first Article of the two Creeds, as in its first Principle; and we are to contend for it, not only as expressly taught in the Scriptures, but as implicitly taught in the Creeds. I make this Observation, because in the Passages of my Book, which you pretend to Answer, I have challenged you to shew that your additional Articles of Faith in the New Creed of *Pius IV.* are involved, or virtually contained in any of the Articles of the Old, and are deducible from them, by just and clear Consequences, or from any other Doctrines of Faith which are expressed in the Scriptures, though not mentioned in the *Creeds*. Will you shew us, for Example, how this Article, *I do acknowledge the Holy Catholick and Apostolick Roman Church to be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches*, is virtually included in *I believe the Catholick Church in the Apostles*, or *I believe one Catholick and Apostolick Church in the Nicene Creed*. Which Article is intended to signify no more than this, that all particular Churches wheresoever dispersed, having, and retaining a Succession of the Apostolical Doctrines and Ministry, make up one Catholick and Apostolick Church. So I pray you, *Sir*, to shew us how, *in*, and *with* THIS IS MY BODY, and THIS IS MY BLOOD, &c. in the Institution of the Holy Eucharist is contained, and connected that Rabble of Doctrines relating to the *Mafs*; which follow these words in the Creed of *Pius IV.* *I do also profess that in the Mafs there is offered, &c.* as before in the Margent. You own the Church cannot make a new Article of Faith; but if you cannot shew that these and the other additional Doctrines in Pope *Pius IV.*'s Creed, are involved in the Principles and Articles of the old Creeds, and clearly deducible from them, as I

am

am sure you cannot, then that Creed is not as *Vincentius Lirinensis* speaks, an *Amplification* or *Exposition* of the Old Creeds, but a New one; not *profectus fidei*, but *permutatio*; and the additional Doctrines of it are so many new *Artus* or *Members*, which are not to be found in the bodies of either of the *old Creeds*, of which the latter is only a Paraphrase or Inlargement, but not an Alteration or Change of the former, as *Pius's Creed* is of both.

The second thing I desire to do by the way, is to enquire of you, what you mean by the *Saints*, and their *Successors*. The Phrase is not common, and I suspect you may have some lurking meaning in it, some secret *Cabala*, or rather some cunning Fallacy, which you would not have the Lady perceive. I observed before, that by the *Saints* you understood the *Holy Catholick Church*; and I have just now observed, that by *Holy Catholick Church* you always mean the *Holy Catholick Apostolick Roman Church*: And then by the *Successors of the Saints*, it was easy for the Lady to understand the *present Church of Rome*, and by consequence to conclude, that the present Church of *Rome*, Successour to the Primitive Church of *Rome*, to which the Faith was once delivered, still had, and still contended against Hereticks, especially against the Hereticks of the *Church of England*, for the same Faith which was once delivered to the one Holy Catholick Apostolick Church; that is, to her self. Pardon, good Sir, these By-observations, which in Controversy are often useful; and now I answer directly to your Question: That the Successours of the Saints, to whom the Faith was once delivered, when Errors arise destructive to it, are not to sacrifice the Divine Doctrines of Faith to Error, but earnestly to contend for them, though they are not expressed in the Creeds; provided, *First*, that they are im-

F 2

plicitly

plicitly therein contained ; or, *Secondly*, provided that though they are not expressely, or implicitly there, they are expresseed or implicitly contained in the Scriptures, in which the whole Faith was delivered to the Saints.

Then you go on with a triumphant inference : *Wherefore as Errors arise from time to time, we are to propose that Doctrine of Faith once delivered, which impugns the Error, or rather, Sir, if you please, which the Error impugns.* This I confess is very true, but then we must shew the Doctrine which is impugned by the pretended Error to be a Doctrine of the Faith once delivered to the Saints : which must be done by shewing it out of the Creed, or out of the Scriptures : For to propose a Doctrine, as a Doctrine of Faith, which cannot be proved out of either of them, is not to propose, but impose, as your Church doth in *Pius's* Creed. Wherein let me tell you, she hath exposed her self with her false Doctrines of Faith to God, Angels and Men. Then it follows : *Now the proposing a Doctrine once deliver'd to the Saints against an immerging Error, cannot be said to be the coining of a Doctrine, but the use of that Faith once delivered.* But the proposing of a Doctrine, as a Doctrine of Faith once delivered, which was never delivered as such, is coining, and forging of a Doctrine with a witness, and an impudent abuse of the Faith once delivered to the Saints. This, *Sir*, is the Crime with which we charge your Church, and therefore I challenged my Adversary to purge her of it ; by shewing that the *Trent-Doctrines* were once delivered as Doctrines of Faith to the Saints :

I hold it (then say you) as an Article of my Faith, that no Authority on Earth can set up a new Doctrine of Faith : And what then, Sir, I hold it also as an Article of my Faith, and it is an Article of Faith that hath been held from the Beginning

ginning, a *Preliminary Article* of Faith to the Creed, and presupposed to it, and manifestly taught in the Scriptures; and in virtue of this Article of Faith, we have forsaken the *Roman Church*, because she hath set up New Doctrines of Faith, which were not delivered to the Saints, and which we therefore cannot profess without making our selves Schismatics to the Holy Catholick Apostolick Church. Then you go on: *But it is as much an Article of my Faith, that we must contend for the whole Faith delivered to the Saints, of which many Doctrines are not expressed in the mentioned Creeds, and yet held to be of Faith by Protestants; as that Baptism and the Lord's Supper are Sacraments, and necessary to Salvation.* To which I answer, that it is an Article of my Faith also, that we should contend for the whole Faith once delivered to the Saints, though many Doctrines are not expressed in those Creeds, because they are taught in the Scriptures: For which reason we hold the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper to be Doctrines of Faith, and the practice of them necessary to Salvation, though not expressed in the Creeds, because they were plainly taught in the Scriptures to the Saints, where the *Trent Articles* of Faith cannot be found.

The mistake of Protestants in imputing to Catholics, that they coin new Doctrines, proceeds from this; that in cases of Debate the Catholick Church assembled by its Representatives in a Council, decides the Dispute, by proposing the Doctrine once delivered to the Saints against a new Error: So that though the declarative Sentence of the Catholick Church be New, as the opposite Error is New which occasioned it, yet the Doctrine then declared is that, which the Fathers brought to the Council, to which they come as Witnesses and Reporters from their several Churches, and by consequence the Doctrine not New.

Here, Sir, I must observe, *First*, that you still presume your selves to be *Catholicks*, and your Church to be the *Catholick Church*, and always argue upon this Presumption; which as I observed, is a very Precarious as well as a most Arrogant way of arguing, which you your selves would not bear in the *Greek Church*. Suppose then the *Greek Church* had assembled a Council more general and free than that of *Trent*, consisting all of *real* Diocesan Bishops, &c. and that in this Council she had determined against the *Supremacy*, or *Spiritual Monarchy* of the Bishop of *Rome*, or for the *Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father*, by, or through the *Son*, would you not laugh at any *Greek* who should argue against you, as you do against me in this Period; saying, *the Mistake of the Latins in imputing to Catholicks, that they Coin new Doctrines, proceeds from this, that in Cases of Debate the Catholick Church assembled, &c.* And if you would not allow the *Greek Church* to assume unto it self the Title, Honour, and Person of the *Catholick Church*; and pre-suppose and premise that as a certain Truth to all Disputes and Controversies between you, you must expect that neither we, nor any other Church will allow you to argue upon that false Presumption, as a Preliminary Article to all Debates and Treaties between you and us. *Secondly*, I must observe that you as falsely suppose the *Council of Trent* to have been a Free and General Council of the *Catholick Church*, which you know all Christendom out of your Communion, as well as we, deny. You say, *the Fathers in the Catholick Church bring the Doctrines they declare from their several Churches*: I pray you then tell me, Sir, from what Churches the mere *titular Bishops* in the *Council of Trent*, who had no Churches, brought the Doctrines of it; and yet they had as good Votes in the Synod as the Bishops, who had Churches, and were the

Squadron

Squadron Volante of the Popes. Again, what do you mean by saying, *they bring their Doctrine from their several Churches*? For the old Custom was for General Councils to examine all Doctrines in Debate by the Scriptures, and Fathers; and from thence, declare what Doctrines in debate were True or False, Primitive or Novel, of Faith or not of Faith. This was the way of proceeding in the first General Council of *Nice*, in the Debate about *ὁμοῦσι*®. They shew'd that the Word had been used by the * Fathers, who lived before them, in the same Sense as they used it in the Creed; and that the Doctrine signified thereby was in the Scriptures, and the constant Doctrine of the Fathers from the Time of the Apostles. The third General Council of *Ephesus* proceeded in the same manner, as one of the best Writers of the *Latin Church*, *Vincentius Livinensis*, hath shew'd, *Commonitor. cap. xli, xlii. Diximus in superioribus, &c.* I have said above, that this always was, and now is the Custom of Catholics, to prove the Faith by these two ways. First, By the Authority of the Canonical Scriptures, and then by the Tradition of the Catholic Church. Not that the Scriptures alone are not sufficient to determine all Controversies, but that very many interpreting God's Word according to their own pleasure, invent various Opinions and Errors. I have instanced in the Proceedings of the Council of *Ephesus*, which met three Years ago, to shew we should not bring any thing out of our own Presumption, but from Ecclesiastical Authority. For when they debated there about fixing Points of Faith, it seem'd the most Catholic, reasonable, and agreeable way of proceeding to all the Bishops, who were about two Hundred, lest any New Doctrines should be introduced by Tricks, as in the Council of Ari-

* Bulli Defensio Fidei Nicenz. §. 11. 8. Suiceri Thesaur. Eccl. in voce *ὁμοῦσι*®.

minum; to resolve, that in all Debates [against Nestorius] the Opinions of the Holy Fathers should be produced in Council; whereof it was evident, that some had been Martyrs, others Confessors, and all Catholics: To the end, that out of their consentient determinations the Sanctity of the Old Doctrine should be confirmed, and the Blasphemy of the New condemned. Then he proceeds to name the Fathers whose Writings they cited, as Judges, or Witnesses against Nestorius, as Petrus Alexandrinus the Martyr, St. Cyprian, &c. and then tells us, that the Fathers intended nothing, nisi ut expugnata novitate, antiquitas defenderetur: And that it was the unanimous Voice and Vote of them all, Antiqua fidei dogmata confirmari, Novitia vero, & superflua ad inventa, & impie promulgata reprobari atque damnari. They took, saith he, all manner of Precaution; ne aliquid posteris traderent, quod ipsi a Patribus non accipissent; that they might not deliver any thing to Posterity, which they had not received from the Fathers. In another place, saith he, We must follow Universality, Antiquity, and Consent. Universality, as when we profess that to be the one true Faith, which the Church confessed throughout the whole World. Antiquity, when we in no wise recede from the Sentiments, which it is manifest our Holy Fathers and Predecessors, openly and plainly taught. And Consent, when in Antiquity we follow the Determinations and Sentences of all, or well nigh all the Bishops and Doctors of the Church. So cap. xxxviii. How in the Holy Scriptures shall we distinguish Truth from Falshood? by doing as I have written holy, and learned Men have done, if we interpret them according to the Rules of Catholick Doctrine, and the Traditions of the Universal Church, in which we are obliged to follow the Universality, Antiquity, and Consent of the Catholick, Apostolick Church. And

where a Part hath rebelled against the Whole, Novelty against Antiquity, and the Dissent of one, or few in Error, opposed highly the Consent of all, or much the greater Number of Catholicks, there let us prefer the Soundness of the whole, before the Corruption of a part.

From all this, Sir, it appears that the Fathers of the ancient Catholick Church, when they were Synodically conven'd, did not, as you say the Fathers of *Trent* did, bring their Doctrines to the Council from their several Churches, but from the Scriptures and the Writings of ancient Fathers, and produced them as Judges and Witnesses; and pretended not to be Witnesses themselves, but Reporters of their consentient Testimonies: And this shew'd the Doctrines they proposed were not New. But the Representatives of your Church at *Trent* did not proceed in this manner. Consentient Universality, and Antiquity, and the Succession of Apostolical Doctrines from the Apostles downwards from Age to Age, was not their enquiry; and therefore it is that we demand of you consentient Universality, Antiquity, and Succession for your *Trent-Articles*; and that I challenged my Adversary to shew they were taught, and received in all Ages before *Luther*: And how well you have answered this Challenge for him, this Examination of your Paper will shew.

It is evident, say you, that Protestants hold many Doctrines not expressed in those mentioned Creeds, and therefore ought not to find fault with Catholicks on that score. It is true, Sir, Protestants, and particularly the Church of *England*, hold many Doctrines to be *de Fide* in the special Sense, which are not expressed in those Creeds; but then they hold, and profess none to be such, but what are either expressed in the Scriptures, or implicitly contained in them, and deduced from them by clear, natural, and easy consequences; and for which

which you cannot deny, but that they have Antiquity, Universality, and Consent; which you have not for your *Trent-Doctrines*.

In fine, we must contend for the Faith once delivered to the Saints. And in *fine*, Sir, we must also contend that nothing be delivered, or received for the Faith, or any part of it, which was not delivered to them, as we are sure your *Trent-Articles* were not.

And in Disputes about it we must have recourse to the Saints to whom it was delivered; to wit, to the Holy Catholick Church assisted by the Spirit of Truth, and with the Presence of Jesus Christ always to the end of the World.

Here, Sir, give me leave to observe, that Jesus Christ is no otherwise present with his Holy Catholick Church, than by the Assistance of his Spirit of Truth. The Holy Spirit is his *Vicarius*, or Delegate over his Church, and assists it as much in *Diocesan, Provincial, and Patriarchal Synods*, as in more General Councils made up of many Patriarchal, or Provincial Synods: I say as in more General Councils. For in reality, and properly speaking, there never was, nor I believe ever will be a truly General Council of all the Bishops in the Christian World. Secondly, I must grant, that the Spirit of Truth is always present, and ready to assist the Representatives of the Church in all Synods, *qui non obicem ponunt*, that do not check, and quench, and resist that Spirit of Truth, as all Synods do wherein the Majority are abandoned to Interest, and Parties, and prejudicate Opinions, and are Lovers of Themselves more than Lovers of God, and Truth. Such was the second Council of *Ephesus*, the second Council of *Nice*, about the Matter of *Image-Worship*; and such was your Council of *Trent*. These Observations being premised, I grant you that in Disputes about the Faith, we must have recourse

recourse to the *Saints* to whom it was delivered, I mean to the Holy Catholick Church in her ancient Monuments; as, First, in the Scriptures, which were delivered to them: Secondly, In the Creeds, which were fetch'd out of the Scriptures: And, Thirdly, in the Apostolical Writers of the Ages next to the Apostles, who attested those Scriptures, and that Faith which was delivered in them to the Catholick Church: And, lastly, in those Councils which had impartial recourse to these Monuments, as the first *Nicene Council* had; and all other Councils, be they never so general, where the Generality act otherwise than from a pure love of Truth, can never have the promised Assistance of the Holy Spirit, his Guidance, Direction, or Blessing; let them call themselves the *Holy and most Holy Oecumenical Synod* never so often, and their Decrees, the *Holy Canons*, and the Church they represent the *Holy Catholick, Apostolick Church*, as the Council of *Trent* doth. All these glorious Titles signify nothing to any Synod, which will not have recourse to the Testimony, and Judgment of the ancient Catholick Church, and make impartial Inquiry after her Doctrines and Practice, and regulate themselves by them: And such a Synod was that of *Trent*, which is repugnant in her Decrees to those of the ancient Catholick Church; having declared Doctrines; yea false, and impossible, as well as uncertain and improbable Doctrines, which the Saints of old, even the whole Catholick Church for Six Centuries, never professed to be the Faith once delivered to the Saints.

None can deny, but new Errors, or Heresies, may arise in all Ages: True, Sir. In which case what is to be done by that Authority which Christ hath established in the Holy Catholick Church, to maintain and uphold every Doctrine of that Faith once delivered to the Saints. To which I answer, First negatively,

tively, what is not to be done by those who have that Authority : They are not to misuse or abuse it ; they are not to set aside or pervert the great Rule of Faith, the Scriptures, as the *Trent-Fathers* have done. They are not to use such mean and sinful Arts, altogether unworthy of the Churches Representatives ; as your own Writers have shewn were used in the Council of *Trent*. But, Secondly, they are to debate in all Questions with Candour, Equanimity, and unbiassed Minds, and try all Doctrines fairly by Antiquity ; of which the Scriptures are the primogenial Part, and decree nothing, as of Faith, but what was so professed and received in the Age, and in the Ages near that, in which the Faith was once delivered to the Saints. This is the way to maintain and uphold the Doctrines of Faith pure and entire, as the Apostles delivered them, and absolutely free from the mixture of such absurd, incredible, false, improbable, or disputable Doctrines, as adulterate and pollute the Popish Creed.

Must not the Successors of the Apostles convened from all parts of the Catholick World : As in Acts xv. 6. The Apostles, and Ancients assembled to consider of this Word. And these as often as new Errors arise, declare against them, as the Apostles did. Ver. 28. It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us. To this I answer : That if Errors arise in a *Diocesan Church*, and spread no farther, it is sufficient for the Bishop and his Presbyters, to meet in a Synod to condemn them ; and if they are Lovers of God and Truth, and keep his Commandments, they will be directed and assisted by the Spirit of Truth. But if Errors happen to spread over a whole Province, and go no farther, then it is sufficient for the Bishops of that Province to meet, and condemn them ; and if they, or the majority of them, are disposed by the Love of God and Truth, for the Directions
of

of the Holy Spirit, they will as certainly be directed and assisted by it, as if they sat in the most General Council, that can be imagined to convene. But then if Errors come to spread over a National or Patriarchal Church, consisting of many Provinces, then it is sufficient for the Bishops of that Nation or Patriarchat to assemble, and condemn them : And if they are rightly disposed for the Directions and Assistances of God's Spirit, they shall as certainly have them, as if they sat in a Council of Bishops convened from the rising of the Sun unto the going down of the same. This I have said, Sir, *First*, because all true Bishops are equally the Apostles Successors ; and if you please to let me add, the Vicars of Christ too, as much as the Bishop of *Rome*. *Secondly*, Because there is no occasion for more General Councils but when Errors over-spread the Face of the whole Church ; nor in that case neither is it necessary, or always convenient that the Successors of the Apostles should meet together from all Parts of the Catholick World to condemn Errors, which may as well, if not better be done by Provincial, or National Councils, severally convening at the same time, as the two Convocations of our National Church are wont to do, than if they met in one place. *Thirdly*, When the Successors of the Apostles and their Presbyters meet in any of the said Councils, as the Apostles and Elders did, they cannot, they ought not to determine as they did at *Jerusalem*, saying, *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us*, because every one of the Apostles had the infallible Guidance of the Holy Ghost, which our Saviour promised in such a peculiar manner to them, and every one of them, as would be Presumption and Arrogance in their Successors to expect or claim. *These things* (saith he) *I have spoken unto you, being present with you, but the Comforter shall teach you all things, and bring*

all things to your Remembrance, whatsoever I have told you. I go away, and come again to you; and I have told you before it come to pass: you have been with me from the beginning. And these things have I told you, that when the time shall come you may remember that I told you of them. And these things I said not to you at the Beginning, because I was with you, and because I have said these things unto you, Sorrow hath filled your Hearts. I have yet many things to say unto you, but you cannot bear them now. Howbeit when the Spirit of Truth is come, he shall guide you unto all Truth. All these Expressions, and many more in the Fourteenth, Fifteenth, Sixteenth Chapters of St. John, appropriate the Discourse of our Lord to the Apostles. His whole address to them in those Chapters shews, that the Promise of his Spirit was made in a most particular manner to them; and accordingly it came upon them when they were assembled on the Day of Pentecost in a most miraculous manner, and ever afterwards assisted them outwardly with Signs and Wonders, and divers Miracles, and inwardly with divers *Xuqquala*, or, Gifts of the Holy Ghost. It was necessary for me to observe this, because your design was to make the Lady believe that the Holy Ghost sat in the Council with the Fathers of Trent, in the same manner, as he did with the Apostles in the Assembly at Hierusalem; which had not been true, though all, or the majority of them, had been pure Lovers of Truth, and Men of dis-interested and unprejudicat Minds, as some few were. But though the Holy Ghost doth not dwell in that peculiar infallible manner with the Successors of the Apostles, as he did with them by outward Miracles and in inward Inspirations; nor Teach and Guide those, as he did these; yet he still teaches and guides them sufficiently, and in such a measure as is necessary for Men who have the Writings of the Apostles, and their Apostolical Successors

cessors for their Rule in all Controversies: And no doubt but upon their diligent, devout, and impartial search of Truth in them, will guide them into all Truth. But the Apostles, who had no Rule of Faith themselves, but were to be the Authors and Preconizers of the new Faith to the World, had need of the immediate and infallible Guidance and Inspiration of the Holy Ghost, who taught them in our Saviour's stead. And the Church having in their Writings the Faith which they once delivered by that infallible Guidance, needs no such Guidance now; nor can the Representatives of it, however assembled, with Truth, or any tolerable Modesty, use the Name of the Holy Ghost now as they did then. The Successors of the Apostles have had the Writings of the New Testament, as the Jews had of the Old; and *like the Jews*, if they will not hear them in their Writings, but resist the Evidence of Truth in them, we may be sure they will resist the Guidance, and Motions of the Holy Ghost. This, *Sir*, was the very case of the *Trent-Fathers*, the greater part of whom, without any regard to the Scriptures, or the Spirit of Truth speaking in them, condemned true Doctrines as false, and declared false Doctrines, which the Apostles never taught, to be of that Faith which they once delivered to the Saints. I must also, before I leave this Paragraph, beg leave to descant a little upon your Question: *Must not the Successors of the Apostles convene from all Parts of the Catholick World?* The *Catholick World* is a restraining Expression, as well as the *Catholick Church* in you and all your Writers, even in the Council of *Trent* it self. And I doubt not but by the *Catholick World* you only mean that part of Christendom only which is within the *Roman Pale*; which, *Sir*, I must tell you again, in that Sense is a false and most insolent Expression, utterly excluding all other Churches from being Members of the
Catholick

Catholick Church, and from the Claim and Title of *Catholicism*, and all the Successors of the Apostles from *General Councils*, but those of your narrow Church.

For unless the Apostolical Authority of declaring what is Faith be continued in their (the Apostles) Successors, the Holy Catholick Church is left helpless against emerging Errors. Sir, as the Church was committed jointly and severally, in whole and in part, to the trust of the Apostles; so it is committed to their Successors, who not only have Authority to declare against Errors and Heresies, but are in Duty bound to declare against them. But then forasmuch as they have not the immediate, infallible Guidance of the Holy Ghost as the Apostles had, but only a plain Rule of knowing Truth from Errors, and what are Doctrines of Faith and what are Doctrines contrary to it; they must apply to that Rule, and attend to it: And that Rule, as one of your best Writers hath told you, and as we must ever tell you, is the Scriptures, as understood by consentient Antiquity; and to this Rule the greater Number of the Representatives of the Church assembled at *Trent*, whatever they pretended, had little or no regard: And to this Rule we appeal against you and your *new* Articles of Faith, and are willing that any Free and General Council, and in the mean time that Christ Jesus himself should be Judge between us.

Now these declarations are indeed New, as the Errors are New against which they are made; but the import of them, or Doctrine proposed to the Church by them are as ancient as the Faith once delivered to the Saints.

Sir, you rightly distinguish here between Declarations made in the Council of *Trent*, and the Doctrines contained and proposed in them; and these are the Matter of my *Challenge*, which you pretend to Answer without Proof, that they are

as ancient as the Faith once delivered to the Saints And not to transcribe your following Period, but use the Expressions in it; *you may register those new and false Doctrines as often as you will into a Creed, and call it, as you do, Pope Pius's Creed, the Catholick Creed, and declare them to be Articles of Faith, attested by Catholick Authority; and yet unless you can prove them to be truly Catholick in the ^a Sense of Vincentius, that is, to be Doctrines which were believed always, every where, and by all Churches, your bare saying, and asserting signifies nothing: For I challenged my Adversary, whose Second you have made your self, to shew, that the Trent-Doctrines were Catholick in this Catholick Sense. The next Period is but a Tautology of the Precedent, and therefore I pass over it to the following Words; And now to speak to the Challenge, p. 190. Indeed, Sir, it is time you spoke to it, for hitherto you have not said one word à propos to it, but advanced, as my former Adversary did, many bold Assertions without one word of Proof; in which you all along presume, and suppose your Church to be the Holy Catholick Universal Church, and your Trent-Fathers to have been the Representatives of the Holy Catholick Universal Church in a Free and General Synod, and to have been assisted by the Holy Ghost: Which you know one of your own Writers in derision of them tells us, they received in a Portman-teau time after time from Rome.*

Now, say you, to speak to the Challenge, where was your Church, and Trent-Doctrine before Luther? I answer, it was where it is, viz. in the Mouth and Practice of the Visible, Apostolick, Ca-

^a Cap. 3. In ipsa item Catholica Ecclesia magnopere Curandum est, ut id teneamus, quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est. Hoc est enim vere, proprieque Catholicum.

tholick Church in all Ages, as the Writers in every Age testify; some mentioning this Trent-Doctrine, and some another. Here I must observe, that you still go on saying without proving. For out of all Ages of the Catholick Church, I excepted the first Six; and neither here, nor in what follows, have you produced Antiquity and Univerſality, for any of your Trent-Doctrines, de fide, in the Writers of any of those Ages, or shew'd their Conveyance and Succession through them all, as I challenged my Adversary to do. Secondly, I must beg leave to ask you, why you would say they were in the Mouth of the Church of all Ages, unless you designed the Lady should think by that Expression, that you had an oral Cabala or Tradition for your Trent-Doctrines, as the Masons say they have of their Word transmitted through all Countries and Ages, from their building of the Tower of Babel: And why you now add Visible to Catholick Apostolical Church; for our Church, as well as yours, hath been Visible since her first Foundation, and both are still visible Parts of the Universal Church; only with this difference, that yours is a greater and ours a lesser Part, and ours pure but yours a corrupt Member thereof. Besides, Sir, the Controversy is not about the visibility of the Church, but the Doctrines of Faith. Neither can you prove, that the visible Church must cease when it ceases to be visible; or that it would fail from its being, if it failed to be seen. But however it is artfully done of you, by adding this word to make the Lady believe, that we maintain the defectibility of the visible Church, or that she fails totally from her Essence, when she fails only from her Purity, as your visible Church for many Ages hath done.

The World is filled with the Quotations of such Writers. To which I answer, as I did to the Lady, that the World is filled with Books which

shew the Vanity, Falseness, and Impertinence of those Quotations, many of which I will now add are cited out of spurious Writers, and others of them are indeed the Words and Sentences, or half Sentences of true Writers but abused, wrested, or misapplied, beyond, besides, or contrary to the intention of the Authors, out of which they are taken.

And in practice Altars were every where erected for Christian Sacrifice. Yes, Sir, for the Commemorative Sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist; for the offering of the Bread and Wine: But not for such a Sacrifice as the Council of *Trent* defines to be in your Mass, a true, proper and propitiatory Sacrifice, in which there is truly, really and substantially the Body and Blood together with the Soul, and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ: Not for a Sacrifice, in which a change is made of the whole Substance of Bread into the Body, and of the whole Substance of Wine into the Blood of Christ: Not for such a Transubstantiation-Sacrifice*, in which Christ is offered upon the Altar; not for such a Sacrifice of which the People are allowed to partake but half, or one kind only; in which notwithstanding whole, and intire Christ, is declared to be received. This, Sir, is the Nature of your Sacrifice, and for such a Sacrifice you should have produced Scripture, as expounded by Catholick Tradition, *i. e.* by Antiquity, Universality and Consent, if you would have answered my *Challenge*, as a Scholar and Divine ought to do. I do not now charge the Nature of your Sacrifice, as defined by the *Trent-Fathers*, with the Impossibilities and Contradictions which are contained in it, but only tell you, that in Answer to

* In divino hoc Sacrificio, quod in Missa peragitur, idem ille Christus continetur, & incruentè immolatur. *Conc. Trid. Sess. 22. cap. 11.*

my *Challenge*, you shou'd have produced fair and clear citations out of the Scriptures and Fathers, and Councils of the first Six Centuries, to shew that the several Doctrines and Definitions, by which the Council of *Trent* hath declared the Nature of the Eucharistical Sacrifice, were in those Ages Doctrines, and Doctrines *de Fide* of the Catholick Church.

People in all Ages adored Jesus Christ in the Sacrament. Very right, Sir, and so in all Ages they adored him in Prayer, and in the other Sacrament of Baptism: Which I say only to observe how you follow the example of Monsieur *de Meaux* and the *Catholick Essay*, in the Loosness and Ambiguity of your Expression; by which you have imposed upon the *Lady*, as if Christians of all Ages adored Jesus Christ in the Sacrament, as you do. But did they in all Ages adore him in the *Host*? Or the *Host* as him? Or did they expose it to be adored as him, and with the same direct Adoration terminating in it, as in him? Did they in the first Six Ages believe him to be corporally Present in the Holy Sacrament of the *Eucharist*, and adore him as so present? Or did they believe the Sacramental Bread and Wine to be substantially converted into his natural Body and Blood, and to be in the Sacrament with his Soul and Divinity, as well as his Body; and as so present, to be worshipped there with the same Adoration that we worship him in Heaven? Shew me that they worshipped Jesus Christ in this manner in the Sacrament, and then you will answer my *Challenge* indeed.

They anointed the Sick. Most certainly ἀσθενῶντες, κάμνοντες, agrotantes, infirmos, those who were fallen Sick they anointed with Oyl, but not μέλλοντες ἀποθνήσκειν, those who were dying, not ἰσχυρῶς ἔχοντες, those who were in the Agonies of Death, or as we say, at the last Gasps. They did not

not in ancient Times defer the Unction, as you do, to the very Point of Dying ; but as soon as the Sick lay down they sent for the Presbyters of the Church, who anointed them unto bodily Health, to which you have very little, almost no respect in *Extreme Unction*. As an undertaker of my *Challenge* you should have shew'd out of Scriptures, and the ancient Fathers, that it was the Practice of the Church to defer anointing the Sick, till in all appearance they were in their last Moments: But in this, as ^a *Cassander* observes, the Church of *Rome* hath departed from Antiquity, and the Custom of the ancient Times, when they did not defer Unction of the Sick, *ad extremum usque vite periculum, & valetudinem jam deploratam*; but anointed them as soon as they fell Ill of any dangerous Disease: And after anointing, if the sick Person were in danger, they gave him the *Holy Sacrament* of the *Eucharist*; but you give the Sacrament before anointing: And when the sick Person is in extreme Danger, then you give him Unction, not in order unto Health, but primarily, and as it were, for the Benefit of his Soul, as a spiritual ^b *Viand*, to procure him a more ready Passage to Heaven. Therefore you call it ^c *Sacramentum exeuntium*, the Sacrament for departing Souls. ^d It is then according to your Church, a Sacrament for Souls, for the Cure and Health

^a Consult Article 22.

^b Ut ex hac mortali vitæ decedentes expeditiorem ad Cælum viam haberemus. *Catechism. Trid.* ^c Ibid.

^d Conc. Trid. Sess. 14. cap. 11. Doctrina de Sacramento Extrem. Unct. visum est autem S. Synodo præcedenti Doctrinæ de Pœnitentia, adjungere ea quæ sequuntur de Sacramento *Extremae Unctionis*: Quod non modo pœnitentiæ, sed etiam totius Christianæ vitæ, quæ perpetua pœnitentia esse debet, consummationem existimatum est a patribus. Primum itaque circa illius institutionem declarat & docet, quod clementissimus, Redempt. poster, qui servis suis quovis tempore voluit de salutaribus Remediis

Health of the Soul, and not of the Body ; for the Spiritual Benefit of the Dying, and not Corporeal Benefit of the Sick ; and by consequence intituled chiefly not to raise up the Sick, but to save the Sinner when he is going to expire. Thus, *Sir*, hath your Church not only alter'd the Practice, but the very End and Intention of Unction from what they were in the ancient Church ; and you being conscious of the Change and Innovation, durst say no more, than that *they anointed the Sick*.

Prayed for the Dead. Yes, *Sir*, they prayed for the Dead, but for what sort of Dead, or how they prayed for them your uncertain, equivocal Expression doth not tell the *Lady*, and therefore I must. First, Then they pray'd only for *such dead* or departed Souls as they believed were Happy, and especially for such as they believ'd to be in the highest degree of Happiness ; for their *Saints, Martyrs and Confessors*. And this they were wont

mediis adversus omnia omnium hostium tela esse prospectum, quemadmodum auxilia maxima in Sacramentis aliis præparavit, quibus Christum conservare se integros, dum viverent, ab omni graviore Spiritus incommodo possint : Ita extremæ Unctionis Sacramento finem vitæ tanquam firmissimum quodam præsidio munivit. Nam & si adversarius noster occasiones per omnem vitam quærat, & capter, ut devorare animas nostras quoquo modo possit, nullum tamen tempus est, quo vehementius ille omnes suæ versutiæ nervos intendat ad perdendos nos penitus, & a fiducia etiam si possit, divinæ misericordiæ deturbandos, quam cum impendere nobis exitum vitæ prospicit. — Res porro, & effectus hujus Sacramenti Gratia est Spiritus Sancti, cujus Unctio delicta, si quæ sint adhuc expianda, ac peccati reliquias abstergit, & ægroti animam alleviat, & confirmat, magnam in ea divinæ misericordiæ fiduciam excitando, qua infirmus sublevatus, & morbi incommoda levius fert, & temptationibus Damonis, calcaneo insidiantis facilius resistit. Et sanitatem corporis interdum, ubi saluti animæ expedierit, consequitur. — Declaratur etiam esse hanc unctionem infirmis esse adhibendam, illos vero præsertim, qui tam periculosi decumbunt, ut in exitu vitæ constituti videantur, unde & Sacramentum exeuntium nuncupatur.

to do ^a annually on the Days of their Departure : And they did it to shew, that the Faithful departed did not Perish, but after their Departure were still Members of the Church, and worthy to be commemorated as faithful Soldiers and Servants of Christ, while they were of the militant Church. Secondly, Therefore in as much as the Life of a Christian is a Life of Labour, Pains, and Trouble, and Trial ; a Spiritual Warfare, in which we are constantly to fight against the World, the Flesh and the Devil : They pray'd God when they were departed this World, to give them Ease, and Rest, and Refreshment in the other ; to perfect and consummate their Happiness ; to give them a speedy Resurrection, or part in the first Resurrection of the Just. This was the way of praying for the Dead, which the ancient Church used. It is first mention'd by *Tertullian* who flourish'd at the latter end of the Second Century, as a Christian Custom or Practice, which among others had been used in the Church before his Time. And our Church, *Sir*, doth not condemn or forbid this way of praying for the faithful departed, but prays God in her Office of Burial, *to accomplish their Number, and to hasten his Kingdom, that we with them, may have the perfect Consummation of our Bliss, both in Body and Soul, in his eternal and everlasting Glory.* But this way of praying for the Dead is not such as your Church teaches as absolutely necessary to be believed and practised, but quite another ; grounded on the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, which you durst not mention, because it hath no Foundation in Scripture or Antiquity. *I do firmly hold (in Pius's Creed) that there is a*

^a Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis annua die facimus, *Text. de Corona*, c. 3. Pro cujus Spiritu postulas, pro qua annuas Oblationes reddis. *De Exhort.* c. 11. Ac si quis hoc fecisset, non offeretur pro eo, nec Sacrificium pro dormitione ejus celebraretur. *Cypr. Epist.* 1. Edit. Oxon.

Purgatory, and that the Souls there detained are relieved by the Suffrages of the Faithful. But the Souls which the ancient Christians prayed for were not Souls in Purgatory, but Souls in Bliss; not Souls in Pain and Torment, but happy Souls: Nor did they pray for their delivery out of that imaginary Place of Misery; but that God would give them the promised Reward of Ease, Rest, and Refreshment after all their Labours, Troubles, and Agonies; to perfect their Happiness, and grant them a blessed Resurrection. And thus they pray'd for the Faithful to honour their Memory, and exercise their own Faith, Hope, and Charity: As *St. Ambrose* did for the Emperor *Theodosius*, whom he believed to enjoy perpetual Light and Tranquillity, and to have obtain'd the Reward of the Things he did in the Body; yet he prayed for him, that God would give him that perfect Rest, which he had prepared for his Saints. So he also prayed for the Emperor *Valentinian* and his Brother *Gratian*, whom he believ'd to be in a happy State; that God would vouchsafe to give them a speedy Resurrection, and thereby compensate their too short stay in this Life.

Asked the Prayers of glorified Saints, just as they did at the Council of Trent, if you will believe the ancient Fathers, whose Writings are express and many. Sir, I cannot but observe how you mince the Matter here, on purpose to deceive the *Lady*, as if your Church taught us to practice no more, than to ask the Saints to pray for us just as we do one another; but this is a great Deceit: For she requires us to believe it, and to ^a believe it as an ^b Article Faith, that the Saints reigning together with Christ, are to be worshipped and prayed unto, and that it is good and profitable to invoke them; and to invoke them for the Mercies that are to be ob-

^a Conc. Trid. Sess. 25.

^b *Plus IV. Creed.*

tained of God through Jesus Christ, to fly to their Prayers; and that it is impious to say or think, that the Invocation of them is Idolatry, or contrary to the Word of God. For all this is contained in *asking the Prayers of Saints*, as you call the Invocation of them, and for this you say the *Writings of the Fathers are express and many*, but you do not produce one; and so the Fathers of Trent most insolently assert contrary to all Truth, in these words: *The Holy Synod commands all Bishops, and others whose Office it is to teach, that according to the Use of the Catholick and Apostolick Church, received from the first Times of the Christian Religion, and the Consent of the Holy Fathers, and the Decrees of the Holy Councils, they diligently instruct the Faithful in the Intercession and Invocation of the Saints; the honouring of their Relicks, and the lawful Use of Images.* Had you dealt fairly with the *Lady*, to the Invocation of Saints you should have added, as the Council doth, the *honouring their Relicks, and the lawful Use of Images*; that is, of *kissing them, putting off the Hat to them, and falling down before them.* And accordingly your Catechism, *ad Parochos*, teaches that they are set up among other purposes, *ut Colantur*, that they may be worshipped; as the excellent Answer to the *Essay* hath already observ'd. But not to insist on these, I Challenge you, and all the Roman Clergy to prove, that *asking the Prayers of the Saints* was the Practice of the Church from the Times of Primitive Christianity. I Challenge you to prove it from the consentient Testimony of the Fathers of any of the Four first Centuries, or to shew me that any one Council decreed it before the ~~council~~ Council of Nice. But, Sir, your Church doth not only teach it to be lawful to ask the Prayers of Saints in her Decrees; but in her Offices she directly asks Benefits Temporal and Spiritual of them; which it is not lawful to ask of any

any but God. This I shew'd at large twenty two Years ago, in a Book, intituled, *Speculum Beata Virginis*, or a Discourse of the due Praise and Honour of the Virgin *Mary*, to which I refer you and the *Lady*, from p. 11 to p. 21. of the Book. I also refer you and her *Ladyship* to the 79th page of the forecited Answer to the *Essay for Catholick Communion*. But as light as you make of the Invocation of Saints, 'tis this, and Image-worship with their appendents, too long here to be described, by which you have depraved the Temple and pure Worship of God, and altered the Face of the Church, as by other Doctrines you have alter'd her Faith; made *Rome Christian* look like *Rome Pagan*; hinder'd the Conversion of *Jews* and *Mahometans*; caused the Name of Christ to be blasphemed among them; and made them look upon *Christians* as Idolaters, and speak of Christianity with the utmost Scorn and Reproach.

But let us go on. *An Author*, p. 190. must appear rash to his own Party, who calls God and his Angels to witness, that the Trent-Faith and Doctrine was far from the Knowledge of Jesus Christ and his Apostles. Sir, by the Knowledge of Jesus Christ and his Apostles, Sir *Humphrey Lynde* did not mean the Fore-knowledge of Jesus Christ, as God, nor the Prophetical Knowledge of the Apostles, which they received from Christ, of Things to come; but the Knowledge which they had as Doctors and Teachers, or Preachers of the Gospel; the Knowledge which they had of Evangelical Doctrines, especially of the Doctrines of Faith which they were to deliver, and accordingly delivered to the Saints. Your *Trent-Doctrines* were very remote from their Knowledge in this Sense, and in this Sense it was not at all rash in him to attest God and his Angels, that they were far from the Knowledge of Christ and his Apostles. Upon consideration, I, who cited him, say the same;
and

and that on the contrary, it is not only rash, but false and impudent in you and your *Trent-Fathers*, to affirm they were Doctrines delivered to the Saints.

He had need to have been an *Eye-witness* of all that *Jesus Christ* and his *Apostles* did, and himself to have heard all that they taught, to make bold with God and his *Angels*; as to call them to witness what he affirms, without being able to offer the least positive proof. Nay, one would think him frantick against himself, when he wishes all the *Anathema's* of the Council of *Trent* to fall on his Head, if the *Roman-Faith* hath *Antiquity*, *Universality*, and *Succession* in all Ages: Whereas *Roman Catholicks* manifestly prove their *Antiquity* from *Primitive Fathers*, their *Universality* from the *Agreement* of *General Councils*, and *Succession* from an *uninterrupted Practice*.

Sir, it was this Passage of *Sir H. Lynde's Book*, cited by me, which the *Lady* freely told me stuck with her above all others; and that if it were certainly true, that the *Roman Faith* wanted *Antiquity*, *Universality*, and *Succession*, she could never turn *Roman Catholick*. But then she offered me your Paper as an Answer to *Sir H. Lynde*, and pray'd me to send her my Thoughts upon it. Now, Sir, in Answer to his Attestation of God and his Holy *Angels* to the Truth of what he affirms; I answer, It is lawful to attest them to the Truth of any serious Matter, especially of Matters relating to the Faith, which we certainly know to be true. For instance, it is lawful for a Man, who hath read over all the Histories and Law Books relating to the Constitution of the *English Monarchy*, to call God and his heavenly *Angels* to witness, that there is no Law which excludes Females from succeeding to the Crown. And so it was lawful for that learned Gentleman, who had read over the Scriptures of the New Testament, and the Writers next in Authority to them, to attest God and the Holy
Angels,

Angels, that Christ and his Apostles had no knowledge of the *Trent-Doctrines*, as Doctrines of Faith, nor delivered any of them to the Saints. And so far was he from being frantick in his Wish, that the words of it are the words of Truth and Sobriety, and so sure am I of the Novelty of the *Trent-Doctrines*, that I am not afraid to wish the same Imprecation upon my self, if you can prove that your *Roman Faith* had Antiquity, Universality, and Succession; and that the Articles of it which we call *New*, were commonly and continually taught, and receiv'd *de Fide*, as Articles of Faith before *Luther*. Nay, so certain I am that they were not so taught and received, that I dare wish the *Antithema Maranatha* of the Apostle, to fall upon me, if they were. And, *Sir*, let me know by setting your Name to your wish, as I do to mine, that you dare wish the same if they were not. But you say *he had need to have been an Eye-witness, &c.* to call them to witness what he affirms. But, *Sir*, this is a very weak as well as an absurd Answer, for how can we know what Christ and the Apostles did, and taught, but by the Scriptures; those very Scriptures, which tell us that they did, and said many things which are not written; but it is to the things that are written, and the Scriptures in which they are written, that he appeals against the *Trent-Doctrines*, and calls God and the heavenly Angels to witness that they were not known to them. Had they been known to them, they had certainly been as plainly delivered in them as the other Doctrines of Faith, that have Antiquity, Universality, and Succession; which he affirms the *Trent-Doctrines* have not. But you say he affirms it *without being able to offer the least positive Proof*, which is another great Absurdity; because the positive proof of those Doctrines, which we deny, lieth upon you. We say they are not in the Scriptures,

tures, and it is your part to prove they are. We say they are not in the ancient Fathers, and we *Challenge* you to shew they are. And I appeal to your self, if it is not impertinent in you, who have undertaken to answer this *Challenge*, and against the very Nature of Reason and the Laws of Dispute, to require for *Negatives* positive Proofs. If I affirm against *N.* that in *England* there's no such Law as the *Salique Law*, would it be proper for *N.* who asserts there is such a Law in *England*, to tell me, who deny it, *that I am not able to bring the least positive Proof for it.* When I appeal to the Common and Statute-Laws of *England*, and challenge him to shew me the *Salique Law* from either of them, from our consuetudinary, unwritten, or from our written Laws, would it not, *Sir*, be next to ridiculous in him in Answer to my *Challenge*, to bid me bring positive Proof for my Negative; which is his part, according to the Rules of Logick and Laws of Disputation, to disprove by positive Proof. *Sir*, you know as well as I, that *Negatives* are not to be proved, but disproved; and you know how the *Schools* would smile at a Man who demanded proof for a *Negative*, especially in a Dispute about Doctrines: But the good *Lady* in whose Hands you put your Paper of Fallacies, is not acquainted with the Rules of Controversy and the scholastick Laws of Disputation; and you had reason to think it would make a great impression upon one more than half perverted by Sophisms; to say, *He affirms the Trent-Doctrines have not Antiquity, Universality, and Succession: And he calls God and his Angels, to witness what he affirms, without being able to offer the least positive Proof.*

As to the manifest Proofs which you say the *Roman Catholicks* have given out of the Primitive Fathers, of the *Antiquity* of the *Trent-Doctrines*, and of their *Universality* from the agreement of

General

General Councils, and of their *Succession* from uninterrupted Practice; I desire you to tell me who those *Roman* Catholicks are: Are they your *Court* or *Anti-court*-Writers? I fear you will find none of the latter that have shewed either Antiquity, Universality, or Succession for the Bishop of *Rome's* Supremacy; or that Obedience is due unto him from all Churches and Christians, as Successor to *St. Peter*, and Vicar of *Jesus Christ*. However, Sir, name the *Roman* Catholick Writers, or any of them, who have given the World this manifest Proof. Is it *Harding*, *Coccinus*, or *Gualter*, or Cardinal *Peron* or *Bellarmin*, or the *Marquis* of *Worcester*, or *Nubes Testium*, which you gave to the *Lady* as an Answer to my *Challenge*, because I presume you thought it a hard Task to answer it your self.

Sir, there is little more in your next Period than in the former, however I must drudge on in a Reply, lest the *Lady* should be told it was unanswerable. Again he wishes himself the same Mischief if the *Trent-Articles* were commonly and continually taught, and received de Fide, as *Articles of Faith* before *Luther*. What Mischief, Sir, the *Anathema's* of the Council of *Trent*? Alas, there's no danger in them, no more than in the Pope's Excommunication of us Hereticks; they are all *bruta fulmina*, we fear them not. If their *Anathema's* be intended as Curses, they Curse whom God will Bless, and their Curses will come like Water into their Bowels, and like Oyl into their Bones. I answer, that if by *Trent-Articles*, he means a particular Form and Dress of Words, framed at *Trent*, to express Catholick Doctrines, that indeed that Form and Dress is New: But the Doctrines are the same which all Ages have brought down to us; as appears from the Sprinklings of Primitive Writers, and uninterrupted Practice, and are no more *Trent-Doctrines* than as they were always the Doctrines of all Catholick Nations. Pardon me, Sir, if I tell you
here

here are Words put together to no purpose, but to amuse and deceive the *Lady*; for Sir *H. Lynde*, you cannot but know, means not the Form and Dress of Words, but the Doctrines, the new, false, absurd Doctrines contained in them: Which you here tell her *Ladyship* again in another phrase, appear to have been brought down to us from all Ages, from the *Sprinklings of Primitive Writers*. I pray, *Sir*, to shew me where those Sprinklings are; they had need be full and thick sprinkled, that every one may see them, and trace them, and gather them up into a Creed from the most Primitive Writers of the New Testament through the next Primitive Writers to them, and so downwards, as I challenged my Antagonist to do. In the next place, *Sir*, I must ask you what Concinnity or Agreement there is between the *Primitive Writers* and *Catholick Nations*; and why, instead of *all Catholick Nations*, you did not say *all Catholick Churches*? By the Primitive Writers we commonly understand the Writers of the first Three Centuries; and then there were no Catholick or Christian Nations, though there were many Catholick Churches: And if the *Trent-Doctrines* are Doctrines of Faith contained in the Primitive Writers, they were such, before there was any Christian or Catholick Nations in the World. For Catholick Churches were long before Catholick Nations, and after the Empire turn'd Christian, there were many Nations in it long before there were National Churches in them, as the Phrase of *Catholick Nations* imports. Nations were converted and made National Churches, or Catholick Nations some sooner, some later; but whether Catholick Churches, or Catholick Nations, I Challenge you to shew any one of either for the first Six Hundred Years, in which the *Trent-Doctrines* were taught, or professed, as Articles of Faith. Particularly I Challenge you to shew they were taught, and received
as

as such in the ancient *Brittish* Church, which I can shew you, was *αὐτοκέφαλον* and independent of the Church of *Rome*: Nay, I Challenge you to shew that they were brought into *England* as Doctrines of Faith by *St. Augustin*, or ever professed by the *English Saxon* Church.

Sir, It is very tedious to follow you in your Tautologies, but what Remedy? Therefore tho' tired, I must go on. And now I pray observe the Fallacy of some Men, and the Mistake of others, who complain of Roman Catholick Doctrines, and Trent-Articles, with one and the same Breath, as if both were New. Sir, great is the Power of Truth, which I should be glad to think made you here distinguish, as we Hereticks do, between the *Roman* Catholick Doctrines, or *Catholick Doctrines of the Roman Church*, and the *Trent-Articles*, which are not Catholick Doctrines of it. But alas your distinguishing thus, proceeds not, I say, from the power or love of Truth, but from a design to deceive the *Lady*, and make her believe that we, by Fallacy or Mistake, equally deny both with the same Breath, and reject them both as New. But, Sir, to speak no harder to you, this is your contrived Fallacy to make her *Ladyship* mistake our meaning, and look upon us as Hereticks indeed, who denied the *Old*, as well as the *New* Doctrines of *Pius IV's* Creed.

And some are so easy as to let themselves be persuaded, that the Council of Trent having invented the Doctrines, erected their own Inventions into Articles of Faith. Sir, I know none of those some, who believe that the Council of Trent invented those Doctrines; for they were invented before, and banded about in the corrupt Schools of Popish Countries, *Pro* and *Con*, for some time, tho' some for a longer time than others, before that Council met. Nay, some were determin'd before in modern Councils, as the Invocation of Saints

and Image-worship, in the second Council of *Nice*; which provoked God to bring those eminent Judgments upon the *Greek*, and *Syrian*, and *Agyptian* Churches, which cannot be described here. So the Doctrine of the Corporeal Presence was first determined by a Council at *Rome*, in the abjuration of *Berengarius*, 1079. after it had been stoutly opposed against *Paschasius*, the first Writer for it, by the best ^a Divines of the *Latin* Church, and particularly by those of *England*; as hath been made appear from the Homilies of the *English-Saxon-Church*, in which it was never received or professed. The same Doctrine was declared again in the Fourth *Lateran* Council in 1215. But then, Sir, though the Council of *Trent* did not first invent those Doctrines, nor first erect some few of them into Articles of Faith, yet they are all chargeable with *Novelty*, because the oldest of them are not from the Beginning, or near it, but want Antiquity, Universality, and Succession; and so are no part of the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints.

Others as non-sensically are persuaded, that the Doctrines in question were once peculiar to the Church of *Rome*; and that other National Churches, which with that of *Rome* compose one Catholick Church, did not rank them among the Doctrines of Faith, once delivered to the Saints. What you mean by once peculiar to the Church of *Rome*, I do not know: But this I know,

^a Such as *Rabanus Maturus*, Archbishop of *Mentz*; *Ælfric* Archbishop of *Canterbury*; *Ratramnus*, otherwise called *Bertram*; *Charles the Great*; *Theodulphus Aurelianensis*; *Amalarius Fortunatus*, and other great Men of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries; particularly by an anonymous Writer cited by *Mabillon*, ad finem, Sect. 4. p. 2. who saith, He never heard, or read of that Doctrine before, and much wondered that *St. Ambrose* should be quoted for it; and more, that *Paschasius* should assert it: as may be seen in the Sixth Chapter of *Bertram*, or *Ratram*, concerning the Body and Blood of the Lord. London, Printed 1688.

that there was a Time, and a Time of many successive Ages, when neither the Church of *Rome*, nor the Churches which were in Communion with it (or with which it was in Communion) taught, or received those Doctrines, as true, much less as primitive, ancient Doctrines of Faith, which were once delivered to the Saints. And as nonsensical as perhaps you may call this Persuasion, I am one of the many Myriads of nonsensical Fellows that are so persuaded; and out of the Plerophory of my nonsensical Persuasion I made that Challenge to my Adversary, which you undertook to Answer; and with what Success and Honour to your self, to your Church, or the Council of *Trent*, you have performed what you undertook, let the Reader judge. Methinks, Sir, the Reverence you ought to have for the *Greek Church*, should have made you forbear charging all with Nonsense, who deny those Doctrines to be Universal: For though the *Greek Church* teaches, and practices some of them, as well as you, and of late Years hath adopted the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* by name, yet they reject others of them, as new, and false, and peculiar to your Church, which would be thought the Mother, and Mistress of all Churches; and have all other Bishops swear Obedience to her Bishop, as Successor to *St. Peter*, and Vicar-General of Jesus Christ. *Neilus*, the learned Archbishop of *Thessalonica*, a Church planted by the Apostle; *Barlaam*, the learned *Greek Monk*, and of later Years *Nectarius*, the learned Patriarch of *Hierusalem*, are some of those nonsensical Greeks, who believe those Doctrines to be peculiar to the Church of *Rome*, which with the National Churches in Communion with it, they do not believe to be the Catholick, or Catholick Universal Church. But, Sir, to acquit our selves who are of the Reformation from the charge of Nonsense, I must tell you, that though we believe all the *Trent-Doctrines* to be New, and affirm

affirm them to be no part of the ancient Faith, yet we do not say, that they are, or even were *all peculiar to your Church*. To be sure they were not peculiar to her in the pure, and happy Apostolick Ages, when she knew nothing of them; and since the times of Corruption, in which she espoused them as Articles of Faith, several of them have been common to her and the *Greek Church*. But, Sir, whether out of design, or no, I cannot tell, you confound the Charge of *Novelty*, and *Peculiarity* together: And thus go on; *And consequently they were not Universal and Catholick*. True, Sir, *And that the Pope by managing the Council of Trent, engaged the Fathers of that Council to draw up those peculiar Romish Doctrines into Articles of Faith*. How the Popes managed that pretended General Council, the World knows very well out of your own Writers, and in a little time is like to know better: And it was by their management most certainly, that the Fathers declared those new and false, which you call *peculiar Doctrines* into Points of Faith.

And conclude, that those Doctrines have been no longer Catholick, than they have been trim'd into Articles by the Council of Trent. What sad stuff is this, Sir, from a Man of Letters! for you know we do not own those Doctrines at all to be Catholick, neither before nor since the *Trent-Fathers* dubb'd them into Articles of Faith. But what follows is more intolerable: *And say, that before the Council they were only Romish Doctrines, but that this Council having put them into Articles of a Creed, from that time they first began to be Catholick and Universal; so that the Doctrines which at first were only Errors of the Church of Rome, became Errors of the Catholick [Church]*. What a jumble of Sophistry is here to no purpose, but to confound an unskilful Woman: For who saith, Sir, that the *Trent-Doctrines* in general, before the Council, were only

Romish Doctrines, or that they commenced Catholick and Universal, after they were put into the Creed? If by *Catholick, Universal*, you mean, as you should do, *Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est*, they were never *Catholick, Universal*, neither before, nor since they were put into the Creed: Nor doth the asserting of them to be as you will have it, at first only *Errors of the Church of Rome*, make them to become *Errors of the Catholick*, but only of the *Latin Church*. But vainly presuming that *the Church of Rome, and the Churches that are in Communion with it*, exclusively of all others, are the *Catholick, or Catholick Universal Church*: then you run on like mad, saying, *This nonsensical Whim repugnant to all truth of Fact and History, prevails so much*. Pray, good Sir, what nonsensical Whim do you mean? Is it the Whim of saying, *That the Trent-Doctrines before the Council, were only Romish Doctrines?* this is no Whim of ours. Or is it the saying, *That they began to be Catholick, Universal Doctrines from the time they were put into the Creed?* That, Sir, is your own Whim, as likewise the other is your own Whim of a consequence, *That if they were at first only Errors of the Church of Rome, they became Errors of the Catholick Church, by being put into the Creed*: As if *Pius's Creed* were the Creed of the Catholick Church. This Whim indeed, as you say, is a *nonsensical Whim*, and contrary to all truth of Fact and History. But supposing it to be ours, and not your own; you say it prevails so much, that *Thousands who even doubt of their Salvation by living in Schism from the Catholick Universal Church, yet foolishly think themselves of so tender Consciences, that they cannot safely be united to the Catholick Church of their Time, because the Errors which were once peculiar to the Church of Rome, by the Pope's management of the Council of Trent became Catholick*. By this Noun of Multitude [*Thousands,*] you mean the

the People of the Church of *England*; whom in the First place, you misrepresent, as not thinking themselves safe in the Communion of our Church, though they are as fully satisfied with the safe Condition of their Souls in it, as if they had liv'd in any of the Primitive Churches, when the Universal Church composed of all Churches, had but one Faith, and one Communion; and every Church was as Catholick and Apostolick, as the *Roman*; and other Churches were no more in Communion with her, or upon any other score, than she was with all and every one of them. Secondly, You represent them as an unthinking sort of People, who being dissatisfied with their own Church, yet dare not unite themselves to the Catholick Church of their time, that is, to your Church; because the Errors of it, by the Pope's management of the Council of *Trent* are become *Catholick*. But do you think, Sir, they are such *Opbes* as not to understand that *Catholick Errors* is a contradiction in Terms. They know, and believe, that no Council can make Errors become Catholick Doctrines, especially Doctrines of Faith, and that no Church can be the Catholick Church of their, or any other time, which imposes and professes known Errors for Doctrines of Faith; and therefore they cannot safely unite themselves to your uncatholick Church. Or by *Thousands*, it may be you mean the great number of Dissenters from the Church of *England*, who think themselves not safe in the Communion of it, and yet have such a *foolish tenderness* of Conscience as will not let them turn Papists, or if you please *Roman Catholicks*: And this is matter of Grief and Offence to you, that when you unsettle our People, and make them doubt of their Salvation in the Church of *England*, yet you cannot so easily bring them over to the Church of *Rome*. You by your Sophistry brought the *Lady* to doubt, if the Church of *England* was such a Church in which

Salvation might be obtained, and in this uncertainty she hath been ever since I corresponded with her; when her foolish tenderness of Conscience as yet had not permitted her to embrace your Communion. But it may be you have since cured her of that weakness, and if she is come over to you, she hath made a sad exchange; for which she must be answerable to God for professing so many great Errors, and practising so many great Corruptions, from which the Church of England, the Object of your Envy and Indignation, hath reformed, as all others ought to do.

What follows in your next Paragraph, beginning with what I now say is all Stuff and Tautology, not worth transcribing; and proceeds upon that most nauseous, precarious, and presumptuous supposition, contrary to common Sense, which is in every Period of your Paper; that your Church is the Catholick Church. The Query which you there put about the Protestant Divines, and which you say puzzles wiser Men than your self, will easily be answered by any Person of common Understanding, that can but see how you beg the great Question between you and us, as all your Writers shamefully do; and suppose what you should, but can never prove, as I shall hereafter shew, viz. that the Church of Rome is the Catholick Church.

These Divines, say you, forced as it were by the Exorcism of Truth, extol the Authority of the Catholick Church, in defining against Hereticks in the first as General Councils; and tell you, that if they had liv'd in these Days they must have been either in Communion with that Catholick Church, or have been damnable Schismaticks. That, say they, was a Catholick Church indeed, free from Romish Errors: Nor were the Trent-Articles, or the Creed of Pius IV. known to that Catholick Church. Sir, not to observe in what course Language you make our Divines speak, I must

must tell you, that all you make them say in this Period is true; and particularly what they say of the *Trent-Doctrines* in *Pius's* Creed, that they were not then known to the Catholick Church. And here you bring no other Proof to the contrary, but repeating your former Interrogatives, *Did not the Fathers of that very Catholick Church erect Altars? &c.* All which Interrogatories are answer'd before, except this, *Did they not make Appeals to the Supreme Pastoral Authority of the Bishop of Rome?* To which it is answer enough, First, To observe in what a sophistical and precarious manner you suppose the Pastoral Authority of the Bishop of Rome to be Supreme, which you should first prove. And then to answer you with another Question, *Did they then make Appeals to the Pastoral Authority of the Bishop of Rome, as Supreme, and as he was esteemed the Vicar of Jesus Christ?* Answer me this Question, prove that they made Appeals to him under that Capacity and Character: But before you undertake it, pray consult some of your own learned Writers, in particular Dr. Du Pin, *De Antiqua Ecclesia Disciplina*, who will teach you other things.

Then you proceed: *Are not these Doctrines of the Church of Rome, which you call Errors?* Yes, Sir, they are Doctrines, false Doctrines, and yet Doctrines *de Fide*, of your Church. And because they are visibly Doctrines of the Catholick Church of our Time, you rather choose to live Schismatics than Catholicks. Here you are at your old presumptuous supposition, which we deny, That the Church of Rome is the Catholick Church of our Time; and that by consequence the *Trent-Doctrines* must be Catholick Doctrines, and we Schismatics, who do not believe them to be Doctrines of Faith.

The long Period, which follows, is made up of several false Propositions and Suppositions, which to be confuted, only need to be observed, First, Then

you assert, that the *ancient Catholick Church* and the *present*, by which you mean your own, taught the *Trent-Doctrines*, which you say are visibly the Doctrines of the Catholick Church of our Time. Secondly, That all the difference between them is, that the ancient Catholick Church taught and practised those Doctrines with less Noise than the present; or as you explain your self, that the ancient Catholick Church taught them without a Creed, but the present Catholick Church, moved by the perverse opposition of *Luther* against those Doctrines, formed them into a Creed; and that these Doctrines are Apostolical, and pertained to the Faith once delivered to the Saints. All these Propositions you have learnedly advanced without any Proof, or shew of Proof; only you say, with an assurance, which adorns every Period of your Paper, that those Doctrines appear to be Doctrines of the ancient Catholick Church from numberless Quotations of the ancient Fathers; which, as I must tell you again, is saying without proving, at which I acknowledge you are very expert.

As to your false suppositions, they are likewise many. First, The common *Crambe*, that your Church is the present Catholick Church. Secondly, That the Authority of the Council of *Trent* to define Matters of Faith, was as great as that of the first four General Councils; seeing all the Advantages applicable to the first four General Councils are but so many consequences from the Truth of the ixth Article of the Creed (*viz.* I believe the Holy Catholick Church) and (by consequence) the Promises of the Divine Spirit, the Presence of Christ to his Apostolick, Holy Catholick Universal Church; all which Advantages, if that Article be still true, pertain as much to the present Catholick, as to the former. Here is supposition upon supposition, even a *Metalepsis* of false, precarious Suppositions: To all which I answer, That the ixth Article of the Creed

is

is still true, even as true as it was at the first General Council of *Nice*; and that Christ will still perform his Promises to his Church, and that the Divine Spirit will still assist all Councils, and Christ by it be present, as I said before, not only in all General, but all Diocesane, Provincial, and National Councils, *Qua non obicem ponunt*, that do not resist Truth, that Holy Spirit of Truth, as the Council of *Trent* did.

Sir, the last Period of your Paper, as far as it is an Answer to my *Challenge*, is of its kind a Jewel of Tautology; and it may be you would take it ill if I should suppress Expressions of such Resolution, as you declare in it. *Had I lived then* (say you) *I should have heard the same Catholick Doctrines, and seen the same Worship I do now, though I should not have heard them drest into Articles of a Creed, as now, and this is all the difference; and for this Men will live Schismaticks. O senseless Galatians! who hath bewitched you not to obey the Truth?* Sir, I'll tell you who hath bewitch'd us poor *Galatians*, not to believe, and practice the Errors, which you mis-call Truth, and declare to be Articles of Faith; the Scriptures have bewitched us, the ancient Fathers and Councils have bewitched us: It is to them that we appeal against the Council of *Trent*; it is in them that I challenged my Adversary to shew me the same Doctrines, either in or out of a Creed. And let it not offend you, if I call not only God, and Angels, as Sir *H. Lynde* did, but Men also to witness, that in your Answer to my *Challenge*, you have not shewed Antiquity, Universality, and Succession for the *Trent-Doctrines*; nor prov'd them, or any one of them, to have been Doctrines of the Faith once delivered to the *Saints*. Far from this, your Answer is but one intricate false Supposition, made up of many particular ones; as that your Church is the Catholick Church; that you of its Communion, whether in *National Churches,*

Churches, or Churches oppress'd in Nations, are the only Catholicks; and that your Trent-Doctrines are Catholick Doctrines, and are to be so called, and not Romish; and that your Church could not err in declaring Doctrines of Faith, because it is the Holy Catholick, Apostolick, Universal Church, signified by the ixth Article of the Creed. Indeed your Answer jingles all along with the words Catholick, Catholicks, Catholick Church, Catholick Nations, Catholick Creed, Catholick Doctrines, &c. You have used them about Threescore times in your Answer, and in your short Vindication of it, which is fully answered in this Reply, you use Catholick Church, and Holy Catholick Universal Church about Ten times, to puzzle and perplex the poor Lady's Understanding, and turn her Brains round with the sound of it; and by ringing it always in her Ears, at last to make her think that the Church of Rome and the Holy Catholick Church are, and always have been convertible Terms, and the very same Thing, as much as a Circle and roundness, or as Man and rational living Creature is.

*In the Bishop of Meaux's Letter to Mr. Nelson, he tells him, he wonders how Bishop Bull could speak so advantageously of the Church, and continue a Moment without acknowledging her. To which the learned Bishop in his Answer to that Letter, which I recommended to the Lady's perusal, asks what Her the Bishop of Meaux meant? Doubtless, saith he, the present Church of Rome, in the Communion whereof he himself lives, and to which his design seems to invite me. Then Bishop Bull proceeds to shew what he meant by the Catholick Church, in his *Judicium Ecclesie Catholicae trium primorum seculorum*, and what he means by the present Catholick Church. After which, saith he, I wonder why Monsieur de Meaux should ask me, whether by the Catholick Church I mean the Church of Rome or the Church of England? He knows full well, I mean nei-*
ther.

ther the one nor the other. For to say either of the Church of Rome, or of the Church of England, or of the Greek Church, or of any other particular Church of what denomination soever, that it is the Catholick or Universal Church, would be as absurd, as to affirm that a part is the whole. And to be sure I never meant the Church of Rome to be the Catholick Church, exclusive of all other Churches. Sir, for fear this Answer to the Bishop of Meaux's Letter should give the Lady a clear and distinct Notion of the Catholick Church, and convince her that the Church of Rome in its purest State was but a part, and now a very unsound and corrupt part of it; which hath changed the Primitive Rule of Faith, altered the Primitive Ecclesiastical Government, and miserably corrupted the Primitive Form of Divine Worship; you proceed again to ring the Chimes of Church Catholick and Catholick Church in the same impertinent manner against the learned Bishop, in the latter part of your Paper, as I have shew'd you have done in the former; and multiplied Words without Sense in that as well as this: And in that as well as this you still childishly suppose, what you should prove, that Church Catholick, and the Church of Rome are the very same. Though it is very uneasy to be no better employ'd, yet I must, Sir, present the Reader with a little of your idle Prattle against the Bishop, that he may see what an excellent Sophister you are, not much inferior to my Adversary, to whom I made the Challenge, which you pretend to answer, some Years ago; and that you and he are equally skilled in the noble Science of Defence. The Bishop of Meaux, say you, congratulates him for the Service he hath done the Church Catholick, but wonders that so great a Man, who speaks so well of the Church, &c. can be a Moment without acknowledging her. The Doctor seems hard of Understanding,

and

and knows not what Church the Bishop means; but asks *HER*! what her doth he mean? Although all the Bishop had to say of him was, as he tells him, for the Service he had done the Church Catholick, yet this great Doctor is at a loss to know, what Her the Bishop means. Sir, say you with great Eloquence, it is to that Her, to which the Bishop said you had done Service, and which he styles *L'Eglise Catholique*, the Church Catholick. Why then will you ask what *HER* the Bishop means? Then, Sir, you proceed to shew, that by the Catholick Church the Bishop of *Meaux* means not the single Church of *Rome*; but the single Church of *Rome*, and those which adhere to her: All which, say you, united with the Roman Church, are the Catholick Universal Church of all Nations under one supreme Vicar of *Jesus Christ*. Such a Church of all Nations, and the Catholick Church are convertible Terms, and no other; and therefore the Bishop of *Meaux* in his Question, asked not whether the Roman singly, but whether the Roman Church, and those that adhere to her, be the Catholick Church? Sir, I must observe here two great Impertinencies and one false Definition you are guilty of in these few Lines. First then you impertinently suppose that Bishop *Bull*, in saying *Monsieur de Meaux* seems to think the Roman and the Catholick Church to be convertible Terms; meant by the Roman Church the single Diocesan Church of *Rome*, which is very absurd as well as false: First, Because by the Church of *Rome* in all controversial Writings it is well known we mean the Church of *Rome*, with all the Churches, whether National Churches as you speak, or Churches oppress'd in Nations, that adhere to her. And, Secondly, because Bishop *Bull* saith, that by the Catholick Church *Monsieur de Meaux* did doubtless mean the present Church of *Rome*, in the Communion whereof he himself liv'd: Which cannot be under-

understood of the Diocesan single Church of *Rome*; but of his own, and all other Churches of the *Roman* Communion; in the Communion of all which he lived, as well as in that of the single Church of *Rome*. The other great impertinence, *Sir*, of which I accuse you, is your *supposing* the Bishop of *Rome* to be the supreme Vicar of Jesus Christ; (for it is still begging the Question) which if you can prove with as much Clearness, as with Confidence you assert, and suppose to be true, then I will grant you that all the Churches united with the *Roman* Church under that supreme Head, are the Catholick Universal Church; and that the *Roman* Church and Catholick Church are convertible Terms, and like the Definition and the thing defined, may be affirmed of one another. This false supposition invites me to observe your Definition of the Catholick Church, which is this: *The Catholick Church is the Universal Church of all Nations united under one supreme Vicar of Jesus Christ*. But, *Sir*, the newness and falseness of this Definition, which you borrowed from *Canisius* and *Bellarmin*, is largely and most learnedly exposed by Dr. *Launoy*, a Divine of your own Communion, in his ^a Epistle to *Nicolas Gatinaus*; and to him in that elaborate Letter, I send you for better Instruction, and with *Canisius* and *Bellarmin* to be chastised. If instead of this *fictitious* supreme Vicar of Jesus Christ, you had put in *Jesus Christ* alone, it had been a tolerable definition of the Catholick Church; which indeed is nothing but *Cætus fidelium*, the Congregation of all faithful Churches united into one Apostolical Communion of Doctrine, Worship and Government, under one supreme Head *Jesus Christ*. How absurd also it is in your Writers by the *Ca-*

^a *Johan. Launoyi Epist. omnes. Edit. Cantabrigiæ. MDCLXXXIX.*
p. 762.

tholick; or *Universal Church*; or *Holy Catholick Universal Church*, always to understand the Church of *Rome*, and the Churches in Communion with it, I have shew'd in the fifth Chapter of the Book of *the several Letters* which passed between me and my Adversary: And therefore, Sir, let me tell you it is assurance in you to the last degree, to suppose your Church and the Catholick Church to be the same in your Answer to my *Challenge*, who had prov'd the contrary; and so often chastised him for his great absurdity in begging this Question, and supposing what he could not prove. In that Chapter I have shewed, that the Church of *Rome* in the ancient Times, was never consider'd but as a part of the Catholick Church, and that it was never understood by the Holy Catholick Church in the Creed; but the whole *Cetus fidelium*, or the Congregation of all faithful Churches united into one Communion, under its one Head and High-Priest, our common Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. But it is the manner of your Writers to misrepresent the Catholick Church, as depending, for her Catholicism and Unity, upon the single Church of *Rome* and her Bishop; whom you affirm to be the universal Bishop, and supreme Vicar of Jesus Christ. She *must*, right or wrong, be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, and he as her Head and Lord, supreme Head, and Lord of them all. In short, he *must* be Head and Principle of Unity to the whole Episcopal College: And as the * *Marquis of Worcester* said to King *Charles I.* she is causally called Catholick because she infuseth Universality into the whole body of the Catholick Church. Wherefore being a center and beginning of Ecclesiastical Communion, and infusing Unity, which is the Form of Universality into the

* Answer to Certamen Religiosum. By C. C. p. 32.

Catholic Church, she may be called Catholic. These are the zealous *Marquis's* words borrowed from *Cardinal Perron*; to which he adds, *That all other particular Churches are Catholic by participation, because they agree, and participate in Doctrine and Communion with the Catholic,* meaning the causally Catholic Church of *Rome*. To this the learned King reply'd, *That in this sense of Catholic, other Churches might be called Catholic as well as the Roman; and particularly the Greek Church, Which, saith his Majesty, hath infused as much Universality into the whole body of the Catholic Church, as the Church of Rome hath done, and was both Center and Circumference as much as ever she was.* The truth, Sir, is, that in the more Primitive Times of Christianity, when all Churches were in mutual Communion with one another; and as so many particular Members made up a Catholic or pure universal Church, it might be truly said of every Mother Church, as well as of that of *Rome*: As for Example of the single Church of *Antioch*, that she and all the Churches that were in Communion with her, were the Catholic Church. Other Churches then were no more; or in any other manner in Communion with the Church of *Rome*, than she was with them, and every one of them; nor was any one of them then esteemed the Center or Beginning of Ecclesiastical Communion, that infused Unity into all the rest.

To draw to a Conclusion. Give me leave, Sir, to resolve all that you have said, and all that I have cited to the same purpose, relating to the *Roman Catholic Church* into Propositions.

I. The single Church of *Rome*, and all Churches now adhering to her, are, exclusively of all others, the Holy Catholic Church.

II. The

II. The Union of the Holy Catholick Church is an Union of all Churches with the single Church of *Rome*, under one ^a supreme Vicar of Jesus Christ.

III. The Bishop of *Rome* is that supreme Vicar.

IV. The *Roman* Church consisting of the single Church of *Rome*, and all Churches now united with her under that supreme Vicar, and the Holy Catholick Church are convertible Terms.

V. The single Church of *Rome* infuseth Unity and Universality into the whole Body of the Catholick Church.

VI. All other Churches are Catholick only by participation in Doctrine and Communion with the single Church of *Rome*.

Sir, my Challenge to my former Adversary, which you undertook to answer, was to shew me Antiquity, Universality, and Succession for the *Trent-Doctrines*; and now I challenge you to shew me the same concurrent Evidence for these Popish Propositions, and then I promise you I will be your Convert; and not only believe, but profess the Church of *Rome* to be the one Holy, Catholick, Apostolick and Universal Church. But then, Sir, as these Propositions, if they are true, lay a mighty and strict Obligation on the Consciences of the Churches of the World, and all and every Christian in them: So they will require as clear and certain

^a This was such a strange Notion to the Christians of Malabar, that when the Portuguese asked them if the Pope was not the Head of the Church, they answered, That he was the Head of the Church of *Rome*, or of *St. Peter's Church*, but not the Head of the Church of *St. Thomas*; always asserting the Patriarch of *Babylon* to be Head of their Church: And that their Church, and that of *Rome*, were particular Churches independent one of the other. *Mohumens Authentiques de la Religion des Grecs.* p. 84.

Proof as the Articles of the old Creed, in which all Churches agree. No less degree of Evidence will convince Nine parts of Ten in Christendom; which are not united in Communion with the Church of *Rome* under her supreme Vicar, that they are in so fatal and woful a Mistake, as they must be, if your definition of the Catholick Church, and the Doctrines which flow from it, are true. Therefore, *Sir*, before you undertake this Proof, let me advise you to consider,

First, How it came to pass, that of all the Writers before *Canisius* and *Bellarmino*, who defined or described the Holy Catholick Church, and expounded the ixth Article in the Creed, none ever made Union with the Church of *Rome* under her supreme Pastor, the Vicar of Jesus Christ, the essential difference in their Definitions or Descriptions, or declared the *Roman* Church and the Holy Catholick Church to be convertible Terms?

Secondly, How that definition of the Holy Catholick Church could agree with it, before there was a Church or Bishop at *Rome*?

Thirdly, How it came to pass that so great a part of the Christian World were ignorant of this necessary Doctrine, and rejected it as utterly false, when it was proposed to them?

Fourthly, How the *Greek Church*, which hath now adopted your Doctrine of Transubstantiation, yet cannot endure this Doctrine, which their Writers declare is invented to uphold the Papal Tyranny and Usurpation, and give all the Churches of Christendom just cause to refuse Communion with the *Roman Church*?

Fifthly, How this Doctrine can be reconciled with the Treatment which the Catholick Bishops jointly and severally gave Pope *Stephen*, accusing

* Concil. Carth. de Bapt. Hæret. Cyprian, Epist. ad Pomp. Firmil. Epist. ad Cyprianum.

him of Tyranny, Obstinacy, Perverseness, Ignorance, Indiscretion, Inhumanity, Boldness, and wicked Deeds?

Sixthly, How it agrees with their calling the Bishop of *Rome* no otherwise than as they did one another, *Fratrem, Collegam, Coepiscopum?* &c.

Seventhly, How it came to pass that no General Council ever gave the Title of *Universal Church* to the *Roman Church*? or the Title of *Catholick* in any other Sense, than as it was given to other faithful Churches, or Churches so reputed?

Eighthly, How it came to pass that Pope *Gregory the Great* abhorred and condemned the Title of *Universal Bishop*?

Ninthly, How it came to pass, that in ancient Times there were so many *αὐτοκεφαλοί*, or independent Churches, as the Church of *Cyprus*, and the old *Britannick Church*, not subject to the Bishop of *Rome*, or any other Bishop as ordinary Superior, but only to their own Bishops?

Tenthly, Whether by consequence from your definition of the *Holy Catholick Church*, it be not all one, as the *Greek Writers* have observed, to say, I believe the *Roman Church*, and I believe the *Holy Catholick Church*?

Eleventhly, Supposing all the National Churches, and Churches in Nations, should fall off from the Church of *Rome* and her supreme Pastor, as many have already done; whether according to your definition, the *Urbicarian*, or as it may happen the single *Diocesan Church* of *Rome*, which had no Churches left to infuse Universality into, would be the *Holy Catholick Church*?

In the *Twelfth* place, Let me ask you, whether of old, in a vacancy of the single Church of *Rome*, the whole *Catholick Church* look'd upon her self as vacant; which she must have done, if she believed the Bishop of *Rome* to be her supreme Pastor, the universal Bishop, and Vicar of *Jesus Christ*?

Lastly, Let me ask you upon supposition, *St. Peter* had said the Words of *St. Paul*, 2 *Cor.* xi. 28. *Besides those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the CARE OF ALL THE CHURCHES*; I say, upon supposition *St. Peter* had said those Words of himself, tell me if they had not been a more plausible Argument for the Bishop of *Rome*'s supreme and universal Pastorship, than all the other Texts of the New Testament, which your Writers are wont to produce for it? What, said one, would the Papists give that *St. Peter* had spoken those words.

Sir, I humbly lay these Considerations before you, and pray you to think well on them before you begin your Answer to my new *Challenge*; and then begin as soon as you please.

I am now come to my conclusion, in which I protest to you, that what I have written in this Answer to your Paper, I have written without any ill Will to your Church, which I wish with all my Heart were a pure, and sound part of the Holy Catholick Church. As we say of our immortal Friends, that we have no ill to their Persons but to their Vices; so I have not the least ill Will to your Church, but to its great Errors and Corruptions in Doctrine, Worship, and Government; from which I verily believe it would soon and easily reform, were it not withheld from so good and necessary a Work by the Pride, and Policy of the Court of *Rome*. And as I have no ill Will to your Church, so have I none to any Person in her Communion; not to you, *Sir*, in particular, though your new Definition of the Catholick Church gives me just reason to think that you are one of her *Court-Writers*, for whom I wish I could have more respect. You would have been in no danger, if you would have come with the *Lady* to the free Conferences, to which I invited her; but to which, I presume, you would not, because you

durst not let her come. I desire you, and my former Adversary, and all other Persons of your Religion to believe, that I understand and practise my Christianity better, than to think that a Protestant is discharged from any of the relative Duties of it to a Papist; and I wish every Papist thought the same with respect to Protestants, as I believe those who have not drank of the Cup of the *Court of Rome's* Enchantment, generally do. I think an Husband, or Father's, or Master's, or King's departing from the true Religion, ought not in the least to abate the conjugal Duty of the Wife, the filial Duty of the Children, the Subjection and Obedience of the Servants, or the Fidelity and Loyalty of the Subjects, or any Duties of Humanity; particularly of Justice or Charity to our Neighbours, Faithfulness to our Friends, or Gratitude to our Benefactors. And therefore, *Sir*, as far as I differ from you in Religion, do not after this declaration think, or *treat me*, which *some Roman* Catholicks have done, as an Enemy upon that account. For I call God to witness, I would turn *Roman* Catholick (for so you call yourselves) with all my Heart, if I could; and if I may be judge of my self, I think I could chearfully lay down my Life upon condition, that the Church of *Rome* were such a Church as all other Churches, could safely hold Communion with: But alas, that is not to be done upon the Principles and Terms of truly Catholick Communion; it is not to be done without forsaking the ancient Catholick Church and her truly Catholick Faith, Worship, and Government; in which all the more Primitive Churches, and that of *Rome* among the rest, for many Ages agreed. It is not to be done without the violation of them all, and by consequence without running a very dangerous risque of eternal Damnation, and partaking of her Plagues, as well as her Sins. Such a dangerous change do they make, who change our for your Religion: And such a sad account,

account, without Repentance, must you, Sir, make unto God, whose business is to go to and fro, and pervert our People from ours and the Primitive Catholick Church, to yours; which differ as much in Purity of Faith and Worship from the Catholick Church of Old, even from the ancient *Roman Church*, as the old Commonwealth of *Rome* after six Hundred Years, did from it self in Purity of Morals, when the * Historian said of it, *Labente deinde paulatim disciplina, donec ad hac tempora, quibus nec vitia nostra, nec remedia pati possumus, perventum est.*

* Livy.

A
LETTER

Written by a

LADY

TO A

Romish PRIEST,

UPON HER

*Return from the Church of Rome to the
Church of England.*

SIR,

I Have ever had much honour for your Person,
and have found your Friendship so largely ex-
pressed to me in your care of my Welfare, that
I can neither be so ungrateful, as to forget it, or so
unjust as not to acknowledge it. Your Merits there-
fore, and my Obligations which are so great, move
me to give you an account of the Change I have
once more made in Religion ; in which, though I
fear I shall miss of your Approbation, yet your
Charity, I hope, will judge me no unmannerly or
malicious Offender, since in what I intend to write

I re-

I resolve to forbear all Invectives or Reflections that may justly provoke you, or any of your Communion; of which you must not any longer consider me as a Member.

Perhaps you'll impute my Change to the inconstancy of my Sex; but though I may be subject to that, as well as other Infirmities of Human Nature, and the weaker Sex, yet I can with a safe Conscience declare, that of all Weaknesses belonging to the one or the other, I think I am as little subject to any, as inconstancy; for which I have Contempt in the highest degree. I look upon fickleness as one of the most deplorable Infirmities, as well as dangerous, where it is habitual; and therefore have always guarded against it. And I speak it to the praise of God, in whom alone is no shadow of Change, I have been ever true and constant to my King, and to my Friends, in all Fortunes and Changes: And therefore to be only fickle in the great Concern of Religion, and Things relating to my Soul, is as improbable, I hope, as I am sure it would be miserable. No, I humbly thank my God, my love to that hath always been constant, though I have varied in the Opinion of Things that I thought best secured my eternal Happiness. Heaven was always the Mark I ever aimed at; and though through mistake of the wrong for the right Way, I have for some time gone astray, yet my Heart was ever fixed there, and in the love and search of Truth.

When you bestowed your Pains in instructing me in your Principles, which I acknowledge with Gratitude, because I believe you intended my good, you had two great advantages over me, the Eclipse of the Church of *England*, and my own Youth; which was too weak to discern her as she now is, and then really was in her self, cleaned from those Mists and Clouds of Error, with which like the Sun, she was surrounded and obscured to

the greatest degree. In truth, *Sir*, when I look back upon those unhappy Times, and consider how the false new Lights dazled the Eyes of many, and indisposed them from discerning the pure light of Truth; and how the Enthusiasms of Pretenders to the Spirit passed for Divine Inspirations, I hope I may be excused for having wandred out of the way in those distracted Times: Especially considering the great advantages I was promised by you, if I would join my self to yours, which you called the Catholick Church. There you made me believe I should find Unity without Division, Light for Darknes; Truth, even the ancient Catholick and Apostolick Truth, instead of Errors; Certainty and Satisfaction instead of Uncertainty and Doubts; and wholesome Food instead of Poison. And encouraged with these assurances, I entred in the simplicity of my Heart, into the Field of your Church, in which you perswaded me to expect nothing but pure Wheat without Tares.

But alas, *Sir*, I have been greatly disappointed, for I have found Plenty, great Plenty of Tares there, which grow so thick, that in truth they almost choak the good Seed of God's most holy Word. Your Church was represented to me as an Heaven, or Paradise upon Earth, as all Peace and Purity; but how little have I, to my great Misfortune, found of all, or either of these, which upon your Authority I expected to find there.

For, First, as to the Unity of your Church, of which you boasted; not to mention the things in which you are united, I found it for the most part to be an Unity of Ignorance and Force; of Ignorance in the generality of your People; and of Force and Terror upon your learned Priests: And yet notwithstanding these and your other Arts and Engines of Union, as your pretended Infallibility, you have more Parties, and Factions, and Divisions in your Church, than are in the Church of
England.

England. I say, than are in the Church of *England*: For as to the Divisions *out of* it, they do not affect her inward Unity, no more than they do that of yours. Tell me therefore in your Conscience, is the Unity of your Church in it self greater than the intrinsical Union of ours? Are you more of one Mind, or have you fewer Controversies among your selves, than we have? You know you have not. You know what different Opinions and Disputes you have about your pretended Infallibility, whether it is seated in the Pope, or in a General Council, or in both; or as some say in neither, but in the Church diffusive. You know, and I know, *Sir*, the implacable Feuds that are betwixt the Jesuits and Seculars; and that these are more inveterate against those, than the *Calvinian* Faction among us are against the *Arminians*; nay, even as much as those *Puritans*, and other Sectaries, who have divided from it, are against our Church it self. In truth, *Sir*, I have found more Argument and Union of Opinion than is among your Priests, betwixt knowing Church of *England* Protestants, and moderate Papists; who though they will not forsake your Communion, yet desire what we have done, were done a little better, and more regularly in your Church by her own intrinsical Authority, which they wish she would exert in reforming those things, which our Church hath reformed both in Doctrine, Worship, and Government; and that the Universal Church was reduced in all Points to the state it was in at the Council of *Nice*.

You told me you differ not among your selves in Fundamentals, but in Matters of mere Opinion, which may with safety be held either way; but if that be an excuse for your intestine Divisions, pray let it be admitted as an Apology for ours; and then Reproach us no more with them, nor make them an Argument against our Church. But I deny

deny, *Sir*, that you differ not among your selves about *Fundamentals*, unless you'll say that Episcopacy and Loyalty are not Fundamentals: Whereof the one sure is Fundamental to the Constitution and Government of the Church, and the other a very comprehensive and fundamental Part of Christian Morality, enjoined by the first Commandment with Promise, and taught us by Christ and his Apostles, as expressly as any thing that belongs to Christian Practice. Certainly, *Sir*, that Order of Ministers, which all Antiquity held to be Fundamental to the Church, as a Society founded by Jesus Christ, cannot be a Matter of mere Opinion; and what Christ and his Apostles taught by their Doctrine and Example, and Christians practised to a Man under Heathen, Heretical, and Apostate Emperors and Kings with so much constancy and in so many bloody Persecutions, must be a fundamental Duty, and as necessary to Salvation as any other practical Duty in the whole Moral System of the Christian Religion. And yet, *Sir*, do not your *School-men*, *Canonists*, and other slavish Court-writers in a most sad manner limit, and mangle, and distinguish away these two Doctrines, in asserting Episcopacy not to be an Order but only a Dignity, and in making Bishops not the Ministers of Christ, but of the Pope; and that it is lawful to take up Arms against Sovereign Princes, to secure the Church. *Sir*, you know this to be true, and that the Adversaries of Episcopacy and Loyalty, who have dishonoured the Church of *England*, make use of the Arguments they find in your Writers; and certainly will make use of them against the Church and King, to the end of the World. Then touching the Bible it self, which I hope is a Fundamental too, did not * Pope *SIXTUS V.* damn all other Copies

* See the Latin Book, Entituled, *Bellum Papale*, &c. Authore Thoma James. In 4°. Londini, 1600.

of the Bible, that varied but a Word from his? And yet did not Pope *CLEMENT* VIII. put out another very much different from the former, and damn all that us'd any other? If you deny this I can prove it; and therefore which of those Bibles to use, as the Rule of Faith, you your selves will be hard puzzled to tell: Or if Infallibility be plac'd in the Pope, which of these two Popes was in the right? If *Clement*, whose Bible you now use, was in the right, then *Sixtus* in *Cathedra* was in the wrong. O unhappy Papists! who are involved in these and many other inextricable Difficulties, which if I had known as well formerly, as I thank God, I now do, I had not, *Sir*, become your Profelyte, nor remained so long in your Church. Then as to that which is the Capitol of *Rome*, I mean the Pope's Supremacy, the Doctors of *Sorbonne* are as much against it, as the Doctors of *Lovain* are for it; both *Romish* Universities and Schools. And as to the Title of Universal Bishop, *St. Gregory the First* was as zealous to condemn it, as *Gregory VII.* who was no Saint, was to assume and maintain it; both Bishops and Popes of *Rome*: and as such according to your present Doctrine, Heads of the Universal Church. Touching the *immaculate Conception*, what fierce Contentions are there concerning it among your Priests; I have heard it my self preach'd by some of your Priests, as necessary to be believed under the Pain of Damnation; and I know Profelytes that believe it equally with any Article of their Creed; and if I would have been one of those credulous Souls, I should have been a Favourite among them: But I was of their side, who did not believe it at all, much less could I bring my self to assent to it, as a Doctrine which was necessary for a Christian to believe.

Wherefore, *Sir*, not finding that Unity among you which I was bid to expect; but on the contrary

trary, as many and great intestine Parties and Divisions, as in any other Church, I began to fear I had made an unhappy Exchange : and that perhaps as there was not that entire Union among you, which you promised, so there might not be that Purity of Doctrine and Practice neither in your Church, which you assured me there was. I began then, by the Grace of God, First, to reflect on your many and foul Superstitions, and superstitious Practices, of which the Religion I had left, was free and pure. I need but name Indulgences, Relicks, Images, Medals, Scapulars, Bells, Girdles, set numbers of Prayers, Beads, Offices of the Blessed Virgin, and the Offices of the *Sodality*, which call themselves of the Society of *Jesus*, and the like ; which were taught me by the Jesuits, under the specious Pretences of Piety, Merit, and strange Virtue and Efficacy ; though you, *Sir*, prudently and craftily concealed them from me. But though it was my good Fortune to be proselyted by you, yet how many Thousands are misled into those superstitious Errors by other Guides ; who allow not their Disciples, when once reconciled, any farther use of their Reason. But you did not so strictly impose upon me, whom you discerned to be of an inquisitive Temper, which led me to inquire into the Grounds, and Causes, and Originals of Things. Indeed it was against my Nature to believe implicitly, I could not forbear to examine, and judge, and give Attention to the Arguments of Adversaries, with whom I now and then contended for what I was made to believe was Truth.

After I set my self to examine and enquire, I found some false and groundless, others dangerous, and some uncertain and dubious Doctrines imposed by your Church upon the Belief of her Children, as necessary to Salvation. I need not mention them all to you, or insist upon them : For the single Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is enough to fright
any

any one, who considers it, from your Worship, and by consequence from your Church. For can I be sure not to commit Idolatry at the Mass? Because if the Priest's Intention, and other ^a Qualifications, which your Missal saith are requisite to that Sacrament, chance to fail, as I cannot be certain that they all, or some of them may not, then there is no Sacrament, no Transubstantiation; and yet Adoration must be given to the *Host*. In that case the Worshippers must be guilty at least of material Idolatry. But from the lowest kind and least Tincture of that placcular Sin, from the Fringes as well as the Garment of that Abomination which provoketh God to jealousy, Good Lord deliver me.

Sir, it is matter of great Humiliation to me, to think I must leave a Church to which I was engaged, and in which through Mistake, I thought my Soul safe. But having, by God's Grace, discovered my Error, and how dangerous it is to persevere in it against my Convictions, I think myself obliged to acknowledge my own Weakness and Ignorance in being misled; and rather to take Shame to myself as an humble Penitent, than stand out any longer against the Truth. Change I must once more in returning to my Mother Church, whom I was so unhappy as to leave in her Distress; and I hope you will not impute my Change to Rashness, or presuming upon my own Under-

^a De defectibus in celebratione Missarum occurrentibus. 1. If the Bread be not wheaten Bread, there can be no Sacrament. 2. If the Wine be not made of Grapes of the Vine, or if it be made of soure or unripe Grapes, there is no Sacrament. 3. If the consecrating Priest happen to leave out any words in the Consecration, which are necessary to the Form of Consecration, there is no Sacrament. And the Priest speaking the words of Consecration secretly, none of the People, at least those who kneel at a good distance from the Altar, can tell what he says, or whether or no he leaves out any necessary words out of the Form of Consecration.

standing; for I assure you, Sir, it is the effect of long, and serious search and deliberation. I have done what I could to find out the Doctrines and Practice of the ancient Catholick Church, and have followed her Guidance in understanding the Scriptures, which I believe contain all Verities necessary for Salvation. And I here declare, and profess, that I believe all that the Universal Church taught and believed as Matters of Faith for the first Five Hundred Years; and particularly I believe all that is in the Confession of Faith made by Pope *Gregory the First*, in which I can find none of the Twelve new Articles that are in the Creed of Pope *Pius IV*. But I find that the present Church of *Rome* doth not agree with the Universal Church of God for the first Five or Six Hundred Years. She hath not Antiquity, Universality, and Succession of her side, nor can I believe her to be the Catholick Church, either as Catholick signifies *Universal* Church, or as it signifies a *sound* and *pure* Church which hath the ancient Apostolick Faith, Worship, and Government. First, She is not Catholick, as Catholick signifies the *Universal* Church, because she, and all the Churches within her Pale and Communion, are but a part, and perhaps not above the Twentieth part of Christendom, or of the Universal Church dispersed over all the Earth. Nor is she, and the Churches in Communion with her Catholick, as the word signifies Sound and Pure, but a Corrupt, Unsound, Impure part of the Universal Church. Corrupt, as our learned Writers have shewn, in Doctrine, Worship, and Government, having receded from the Rule of Scriptures, and from the true, ancient, Catholick Tradition, to which all Churches ought to be conformed, and according to which I wish she were by a happy Re-

* See the Confessions of Gregory I, in *Liber diurnus Romanorum*,
formation

formation made, as conformable as ours. How corrupt and eccentric she is in Doctrine from the ancient Catholick Church, your Creed compared with the ancient Creeds and Confessions doth shew, and how corrupt in Worship she is, and differing in that from the Practice of the ancient Church in all Places: Your praying unto Saints for blessings Temporal and Spiritual, your invocation of Angels, your worshipping the Cross, and declaring *Latria* to be due to it, and your consecration of Images, setting them over your Altars, and directing your Devotions through them to Christ and the Blessed Virgin, and other true or false Saints, whom they are made to represent, are a plain, full, and ample Testimony. And then as for the Government or Discipline of it, it is mere Tyranny and Usurpation, contrary to the collegiate Nature of the Catholick Church; the particular Church of *Rome* not only pretending contrary to Fact delivered in Scripture, to be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, and as such to be the Center and Principle of Unity unto the Catholick Church; but that her Bishop, as *St. Peter's* Successor, is Christ's Vicar and supreme Head of his Church on Earth; which the *Greek*, and all the Oriental Churches, and the Church in the *Abyssin Ethiopia* with the greatest Scorn and Indignation withstand to this Day. Yet this is the Church you say, which brings me to the Scriptures, and from which I must receive the Sense of the Scriptures, tho' she hath added Books to canonical Scripture, which the ancient Catholick Church never owned to be such, and wrested them to Senses in divers places, in which she never understood them. But admit it were she which brings me to the knowledge of the

* *The Rubrick to Ordo ad recipiendum processionaliter Imperatorum, in the Roman Pontifical.*

Scriptures, and the true Sense of them, yet she can do it no otherwise than as the ancient Church did by her Testimony and Tradition, but is she therefore above them. The true Tradition of the Church conveyed down from Age to Age in the Writings of the ancient Fathers, tells me in what Books they are contained, and that those Books were written by Men inspired by God: But then though I believe them to be such upon her external Testimony and Tradition, yet I have farther intrinsecal Evidence from the Scriptures themselves, as the *Samaritans*, who when they had heard Christ, did not rest in the Testimony of the Woman who brought them to him, but said unto her; *Now we believe, not because of thy saying, for we have heard him our selves, and know that this is indeed the Christ, and the Saviour of the World.* All that the Church can do is to attest the Scriptures, and the Sense of them in controverted Points; and her we are ready to hear as she speaks in the ancient Fathers and Councils, who were the living, governing Church in the best and purest Times. To them our Writers have often told you we appeal, as to judges in all things wherein we differ not only from yours, but other Churches: To them, I say, we appeal to whom every Church ought to appeal in all Controversies when they are truly such, by being lawfully called, and permitted to act freely without Fear, Force, or Corruption, and to examine the Scriptures and the Fathers fairly and impartially, as was wont to be done in the ancient General Councils. But for good Reasons, *Sir*, we deny your Council of *Trent* to be such, because it was not a General, but a Particular Western Council, full of unworthy Arts and Influences, Partiality and Corruption, in which nothing was proposed but by the Pope's Legates, Monsieur *Rancin's* Review of that Council, and Father *Paul's* History of it will be Evidence against it,

it, and its proceedings, as long as the World endures. For my part I believe that God now as in the Primitive Times, before there were General Councils, assists a Provincial or a National Council by his Spirit, as much as any General Councils; and such we have had many in *England* since the Reformation lawfully called, and freely acting without Fear, Force, or Fraud, which have reformed and established our Church in the pure Primitive Faith, Worship, and Polity, according to that intrinsecal Right and Power which every Church, National, Provincial, or Diocesan hath to reform it self, and is bound so to do, when there is occasion. Wherefore, *Sir*, I doubt not but Christ was, by his Spirit, with our *English* Clergy in their Convocations, which debated freely, and after diligent and impartial examination of the Scriptures and ancient Catholick Tradition establish'd the Reformation; and to that Church so reformed by the divine Assistance, as an humble Penitent, I return. To that Church which for above an Hundred Years hath been pure in Faith and Worship; apostolical in her Polity and Succession; decent in her Ceremonies; happy in a valid Ministry; devout in her Liturgy; intelligible in her Worship by her most illiterate Children; sound in her Catechism, Homilies, and Articles; right and indeficient in her Ordinal; canonical in her Hours of Prayer; judicious and prudent in her Canons and Constitutions; primitive in her annual Feasts and Fasts; and in a word, built in every part upon the Foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner-stone.

This Church, *Sir*, hath weeded the Tares the *Romanists* sowed in her out of her Corn; winnowed the Chaff from the Wheat; and separated the Dross and baser Mettals from the pure Gold of the Christian Religion; and reduced her self to the ancient

Use and Standard of the Scriptures, as understood and expounded by the true old Catholick Tradition, as I beg leave to represent to you in some instances, in which she hath reformed.

Thus she praiseth God, as the Primitive Church did for the Ministry of the Holy Angels, and begs their Protection of God, as Guardians he hath appointed to watch over us; but she doth not teach us to worship or invoke them. She teacheth us also to honour the Saints, and to praise God for them, both for the Grace he gave them, and for the Benefit of their holy Examples, which we ought to follow, and to rejoice in their Happiness. Such Honour indeed have all his Saints: Honour in honourable Commemorations; but not Worship by Prayers, Altars, and Invocations, which your Church practises contrary to the Doctrine of Scriptures, and Practice of the Primitive Church, as our Writers have shewn.

So she teaches Heaven and Hell to be places prepared by God for eternal Reward and Punishment; and denies not Third Places of Custody or Repositories of good and bad Souls till the Day of Judgment, which many of the Ancients believed; but she doth not teach it, or make it an Article of Faith, as your Church doth her Fiction of a Penal, Local Purgatory: Which because you cannot prove to be a true Opinion from Scripture or Antiquity, she expressly denies. O, *Sir!* how happy would it be for you, and for the Christian World, if your Church would learn her Modesty in being silent, where the Scriptures and Antiquity say nothing; nor make doubtful, and disputable *School-points*, much less such as are improbable, false, or absurd Doctrines, *Articles of Faith*.

So all her Offices are penn'd in the Mother-Tongues of her People. Her *French* Congregations have them in *French*, the *Welsh* People, that under-

understand not *English*, in the *British*, and in the Isle of *Man* they worship God in the *Mansk*, as we do in our *English* Tongue. But your Church is a *Barbarian* to her People, for she prays in a Tongue even in *Rome* it self, which the common People do not understand: So that as our Lord said to his ambitious Disciples, that they knew not what they ask'd, may be truly said of them, that they know not what they pray for, nor to what they say *Amen*. They, poor abused Souls, cannot pray with the *Spirit*, because they cannot pray with the *Understanding*; but blessed be God, the most illiterate in our Communion, if they want not inward Devotion, pray with the *Spirit*, and with the *Understanding* also.

She also acknowledges a *propitiatory* Sacrifice, I mean the *grand propitiatory* Sacrifice, which Christ made of himself once upon the Cross, and allows in her Writers, the ancient distinction of the *bloody* and *unbloody* Sacrifice: But then as by the *bloody* Sacrifice, they understand that of Christ, in which he shed his precious Blood for the Sins of the whole World; so by the *unbloody* Sacrifice they mean the Holy *Eucharist* or Sacrament of the Altar, in which the bloody Sacrifice is not only commemorated by the Faithful, but, presented before God in its proper Symbols; whereof the one represents the Body, and the other the Blood of Christ crucified according to his own Institution: And this commemorative *unbloody* Sacrifice, is no otherwise propitiatory than our Prayers are; to wit, in virtue of that Propitiation which was made by the bloody Sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross. A true and proper propitiatory Sacrifice therefore the Holy *Eucharist* is not, as your Church absurdly teacheth, though it is a commemorative Sacrifice. I say, as your Church absurdly teacheth in contradiction to its own Canon of the Mass,

where you ^a beg acceptance of your Sacrifice of the Altar through Christ; which you need not do if it were Propitiatory in its own Nature, and by its own Virtue, as that of Christ upon the Cross was: Much more, if by the words of Consecration it be really, truly, and substantially converted into the Body and Blood of Christ; and that his Body and Blood is truly, really, and substantially in the Sacrament with his Soul and Divinity, as your Creed asserts. For if the same Christ, who was born of the Virgin, put to Death upon the Cross, rose again from the Dead, and ascended into Heaven, be corporally present in the Host with his Soul and Divinity, then in effect you beseech God in that Prayer, to accept Christ on the Altar for Christ's sake in Heaven; and also ^b beseech Christ in Heaven, through Christ upon the Altar, to deliver you from all your Sins. Besides, if the same Christ who offered up himself in a bloody manner upon the Cross, be offered without Blood in the Sacrifice of the Mass; how saith the Apostle so emphatically, and so often, that he was *once* offered to put away Sin; that is, once offered as an all-sufficient Sacrifice for the Sins of the World: For by one offering, one all-sufficient Sacrifice for Sins, he hath for ever perfected them who are sanctified. But according to your Doctrine of the true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mass, it is needful he should be daily offered upon the Altar: And then there are more

^a Placeat tibi Sancta Trinitas obsequium servitutis meæ, & præsta, ut Sacrificium, quod oculis tuæ Majestatis indignus obtuli Tibi sit acceptabile mihiq; & omnibus, pro quibus, illud obtuli, sit Te miserante, propitiabile, per Christum Dominum nostrum. Amen.

^b Domine Jesu Christi, Fili Dei vivi, &c. libera me per hoc sacro-sanctum Corpus, & sanguinem tuum ab omnibus iniquitatibus meis & Universis malis, &c. Amen.

all-

all-sufficient Sacrifices of Christ ; to wit, one upon the Cross and one daily upon the Altar : Which is a flat contradiction to the Apostle, who tells us of no offering up of Christ, but of that one which he once made of himself upon the Cross. But your Church hath another all-sufficient Sacrifice of him, and of equal Merit in the Mass, not only sufficient to atone God for the Sins and Punishments of the Living, but for the Dead in Purgatory, who are not perfectly and fully purged. But according to our Doctrine, the Sacrament of the Altar is no more than a commemorative or representative Sacrifice in the sight of God made acceptable to him, and effectual to the worthy Receiver for obtaining Remission of Sin, and all other Mercies in virtue of, and in conjunction with the one propitiatory Sacrifice upon the Cross, to which it is mystically united. And in this sense we have a true, full, and complete Sacrifice and Sacrament in both kinds ; whereas you pretend to have a true Sacrament for the People but in one, contrary to the Doctrine and constant Practice ; and as it appears from thence, to the very Thoughts and Intentions of the Catholick Church for above a thousand Years. I pray God this sacrilegious Doctrine of receiving whole Christ in one kind, as well as the other of Christ's Body and Blood with his whole Soul and Divinity, being truly, really, and substantially in the Sacrament, make not both your Sacrifice and Sacrament an Abomination, and Iniquity in the sight of God.

I should also have observed, that at your Altar Christ there declared to be corporally present with his Body, Soul, and Divinity, is as much adored as he is in Heaven : So that in that Prayer which you repeat Thrice, after a piece of the *Host* first signed Thrice with the sign of the Cross,

‡ Hostiam consecratam genuflexus adorat.

New Testament is the most primitive and authentic Record. Suffer me therefore to go on first to the number of the *Sacraments*, which in the large Theological sense of the word *Sacrament*, as it is used in the *Latin*, and answers to Mystery in the *Greek Church*, she acknowledges to be many; and hath no difference with you about the number of Sacraments in that large Sense of the Word, wherein it is taken for an holy or religious Sign or Symbol; which mystically exhibits one thing to Sense, and another to the Understanding. In this Sense there are many Sacraments or Mysteries. But our Church with great Judgment and Propriety of Speech, according to the Doctrine of the Scriptures, hath restricted the Word to its most special and eminent Sense; in which as it signifies holy, fœderal, outward Signs or Symbols of inward spiritual Grace and Favour, instituted by God in the Christian Church, as ordinary means of Grace and Salvation generally necessary for all Men. And in this special strict Sense of the word, she owns only two Sacraments or Mysteries, *Baptism* and the *Lord's-Supper*, and thereby distinguishes the other Five, commonly called Sacraments, from those Two, as they ought to be distinguished; because they are not Sacraments of the same Dignity, *viz.* Holy Signs of the Covenant betwixt God and his Church, nor generally necessary for all, as the other Two are, and binding to all in point of Duty; though God is not so tyed to them, as he cannot act without them: They do not limit and confine him, who in cases of true and absolute Necessity can give his Grace, both his pardoning and sanctifying Grace without them. I say in true, and absolute Necessity, when all diligence on our part being used, we cannot have them, as in the case of Infants, whom dying unbaptized you exclude from Heaven.

Thus, Sir, I have been taught by our Church, and her learned Divines, to understand the different Nature and Use of the Two Sacraments, or mystical federal Rites, from the other Five, which your Church makes to be true and proper Sacraments, of equal Dignity with the other Two. But I have been better instructed in the Nature of every one of them.

As, First, of *Orders* or *Ordination*, which they hold to be sacred, and necessary, by divine appointment, for the Ministry of the Church, and that whoever climbs up into the Fold without them, let his Gifts be never so great, is a Thief and a Robber. And as our Ordinations are derived by continued Succession from the Apostles, so are they performed after the primitive Apostolical manner, according to the Scriptures, by solemn Prayer and Imposition of Hands, without any of your new Mixtures, as the *Cup* and *Patin*, or the Benediction: In which the Bishop prays, that the Person ordained may be blessed in the Priestly Office, and offer propitiatory Sacrifices to Almighty God for the Sins of the People. These additions you make Essential to the Ordination of a Priest, though but of late Original, as some of your learned Writers are forced to confess. I am unwilling to put you in mind of the Slander you raised of our Church, by the Fiction of the *Nag's-Head* Ordination, which some of your Priests are not yet ashamed to tell as a Truth.

Another of your Sacraments is *Confirmation*, which tho' we believe it to be an Apostolical Rite and Institution, which ought to be observed in all Churches; and accordingly our Church hath a particular Office appointed for it, and our Bishops duly administer it with great Reverence, by Prayer and Imposition of Hands upon the baptized, when they are come to years of Discretion, and are rightly instructed and prepared.

As to *Penitence*, or solemn penitential Confession, which you reckon among the Sacraments, our Church recommends it to Consciences troubled with the sense of their Sins. She holds it as requisite as Physick for the Sick, and thinks the ministerial Power of absolving humble, and truly contrite Penitents a part of the Priestly Office; and enjoins her Priests to absolve such, according to the Power which our Lord Jesus Christ hath left to his Church: But she appoints no Pœnitentiaries for auricular Confession, which with great reason she disallows.

Matrimony we allow to be a Mystery, or Sacrament in the large Sense of the Word, as it is taken for any sacred Symbol, because it signifies unto us the Mystical Union that is betwixt Christ and his Church: Who is pleased to call her his Bride, and Spouse, and himself her Bridegroom. And by his Love, and mystical Marriage-union with her, teacheth us the Holiness of the Marriage-state, and Husbands and Wives their mutual Duty to one another.

As to *Extreme Unction*, another of your Sacraments so called, our Church at the beginning of the Reformation, reduced the great Abuse of it to anointing the sick Person with Oyl, according to *Mark* xvi. 13. and *James* v. 14. ordering the Priest, if the sick Person desire it, to anoint him on the Forehead or Breast, only making the Sign of the Cross; and to proceed to ^a a devout Prayer for the sick

^a *The Order of the Visitation of the Sick in the Book of Common-Prayer, set forth in 1549. to be used throughout England.*

R U B R I C K.

If the sick Person desire to be anointed, then shall the Priest anoint him upon the Forehead, or Breast, only making the Sign of the Cross, saying thus.

As with this visible Oyl thy Body outwardly is anointed; so our Heavenly Father, Almighty God, grant of his infinite Goodness, that thy Soul inwardly may be anointed by the Holy Ghost, who is the Spirit

sick Person, a Practice, I confess, which I have heard some learned and pious Divines wish had not been since left out of the Office for the Visitation of the Sick. But then, as your Church is guilty of many abuses, so particularly of perverting the Use of this Ceremony; not in anointing the Sick for bodily Health, but the *Dying*, of whose Life there is no hope, as a *Viand* to them who are departing out of the World; for which there is no ground in Scripture, nor in the practice of the ancient Church.

As for *Miracles*, of which I have heard much among you, we hold them not necessary to the Church, having the powerful Evidence of former Miracles, and the Testimony of so many holy Martyrs and Confessors, and the written Word of God, which we think sufficient Reasons and Motives of Belief; and that the Faith of those who have believed without Miracles, since Miracles ceased, hath a particular Testimony of approbation and acceptance from his blessed Mouth; who said unto St. Thomas,

Spirit of all Strength, Relief, and Gladness. And vouchsafe for his great Mercy (if it be his blessed Will) to restore unto thee thy bodily Health and Strength to serve him; and send thee release of all thy Pains, Troubles, and Diseases, both in Body and Mind. And howsoever his Goodness (by his divine and unsearchable Providence) shall dispose of thee: We his unworthy Ministers and Servants, humbly beseech the eternal Majesty to do with thee according to the Multitude of his innumerable Mercies; and to pardon thee all thy Sins and Offences, committed by all thy bodily Senses, Passions, and carnal Affections: Who also vouchsafe mercifully to grant unto thee ghostly Strength by his holy Spirit, to withstand, and overcome all Temptations, and Assaults of thine Adversary, that in no wise he prevail against thee; but that thou mayest have perfect Victory and Triumph against the Devil, Sin, and Death, through Christ our Lord; who by his Death hath overcome the Prince of Death, and with the Father and the Holy Ghost, evermore liveth and reigneth God, World without end. Amen. So in the celebration of the Holy Communion for the Sick, there is this Rubrick: And if the Sick desire to be anointed, then shall the Priest use the appointed Prayer without any Psalm.

who

who would not believe without seeing, *Blessed are they, who have not seen and yet have believed.* However if you, who talk so much of your Miracles, will work beneficial and lasting Miracles among us; if you'll feed five Thousand of us with a few Loaves, and a few Fishes, if you'll Cure all Diseases, give Sight to the Blind, make the Lamé Walk, and Raise the Dead; and do these Wonders openly in the places of publick Concourse, in our Streets and Piazza's, at the Gates of our Cities and Temples, and in the Highways; if you'll speak strange Languages, and Prophecie, and cast out Devils, and shew these miraculous Powers and Gifts in heretical, and other schismatical Countries, then we will believe your Church to be the Holy Catholick Church; or if we do not, then shake off the Dust of your Feet as a Testimony against us, and Seal us up in Unbelief. But Miracles, *Sir*, pretended to be wrought among your selves, only in your own Churches and Cloysters, and among the Ignorant, Credulous, and Superstitious; and those who already believe your Shrine-cures and Crucifix-cures, your sweating and bleeding Images, the Conception of your Women by virtue of *St. Francis's Cordon*, your *Teresian* Visions, and such like pretended Wonders among you, will never make us believe your Church to be the true, or only true Church; to be the Mother and Mistress of all Churches; the Church, which is the Centre of Ecclesiastical Communion, that infuseth Unity, the Form of Universality into all other Churches, who are no otherwise to be called Catholick but by participation and agreement in Doctrine and Worship with her, and Subjection to her Head, the Pope. *Sir*, the *English* Protestants will never believe these, and your other incredible Doctrines upon the sight, or report of such pretended local Miracles among you; but rather harden them in their Heresy and Schism, which you so frankly lay to their charge.

Next

Next to your Miracles, you are wont to boast of your wonderful Conversions of Nations by your Missioners: But how, or to what did you convert them?

^a You converted a great part of the Christians of *St. Thomas*, in the *East-Indies*, by most cruel and barbarous Persecutions ^b, forcing them against their Consciences, to embrace your Religion, and come into the Communion of your Church. And if these, and all your Persecutions, and the Havock you have made of God's People in them were computed, I fear it would appear, you have not converted more (I should have said perverted) than you have destroyed. *Mar Abraham* and *Mar Joseph*, as well as *Cyril Lucar* among the *Greeks*, will rise up in Judgment against you: And in the mean time the Blood shed by you in *Malabar*, as well as in the Western World, will cry for Vengeance, and hasten that terrible Day, when for shedding the Blood of the Saints, God shall give you Blood to drink.

I have also heard, that among the *Chineses* you are wont to represent *Jesus Christ* to them as a great Hero, and not as a poor crucified Man; who proved himself to be God, and the Saviour of the World, by his Resurrection from the Dead. You there also, as I am told, allow your Converts to worship *CONFUSIUS* with *Christ*, and that you set up their, and your Images together. Nor do you give the Nations under the *Rising Sun*, the pure Doctrines of the Gospel, by which Heathens of old were converted; but such as the corrupt Gospel of *Hieronymus Xaverius*, a Jesuit of *Biscay*, which he made up of false, ridiculous, idolatrous, and other impious Mixtures, without mentioning the Instituti-

^a Of these barbarous Persecutions there is a good account given in a late excellent French Book, printed at Rotterdam, 1707. with this Title, *Dissertations Historiques sur divers Sujets*.

^b See a short and clear account of the Persecutions of the Christians of *St. Thomas*. *Monumens Authentiques de la Religion des Grecs*. p. 89. &c.

on of the *Holy Eucharist*, because he durst not expose your absurd Doctrine of Transubstantiation, which is so contrary to the obvious figurative Sense of the words of its Institution. Thus you would be wiser than God; you would not trust to him in preaching the pure uncontaminate Gospel to the *Orientals*, though by the Foolishness of it he confounded the Wisdom of the *Greeks* and *Romans*, who were as bright People as any the East can shew. But your Missioners took another course than the Missioners of Christ did; they would not trust to the Foolishness of God, which is wiser, and to the Weakness of God, which is stronger than Men, but to their own human Politicks and Inventions. And I appeal to your Conscience, *Sir*, whether their Conversions are like those of the Apostles, unto the pure Faith of the crucified Jesus, whom God hath made both Lord and Christ. In short, *Sir*, your Conversion of other Christians is a mere Perversion, and those you have converted from Heathenism to your Religion, have need again to be converted to the true Catholick and Apostolick Faith, which was once delivered to the Saints. In the *West-Indies* you were much more intent upon killing than converting, having had more mind to the Gold of the Natives of the Islands and Continents, than to their Conversion; and to plunder their Treasures, than to save their Souls. In *Hispaniola* the *Spaniards* reduced 3 Millions of innocent People to less than 300. They made the rich Island of *Cuba*, and many other Islands intirely desert; and in the Continent they ruined Ten Kingdoms bigger than all *Spain*, by most barbarous and unheard of Cruelties. *Don Barthol. de las Casas*, Bishop of *Chiaba*, relates all these inhumane Butcheries and Rapines, who was an Eye-witness of them; and *Spain* the most Roman Catholick of all Countries, is still in Debt to Divine Vengeance for these monstrous Cruelties, which no Man who is
not

not abandon'd to Humanity, can read, relate, or hear without Horror.

You are also wont to object, that we have a *Parliamentary Church*, and a *Parliamentary Religion*, for no other Reason that I know, but because our Kings by their Acts in Parliament have confirmed the Reformation, and added the Civil Sanction to the Acts of the Church. For the same Reason your Church in the Realms of *England*, *Scotland*, and *Ireland*, was a *Parliamentary Church*, and your Religion a *Parliamentary Religion* before the Reformation: And you would be very glad to have it acknowledged, and established again in these Kingdoms by Acts of Parliament, as it was here in Queen *Mary's* Days. You also reproach us with owning the King to be the Head of the Church, which you should not do, were it true; because your Bishops and Clergy in their Act of Submission, first owned King *Henry VIII.* to be so before the Reformation. But tho' your Bishops did, we do not own the King to be the Head of the Church, but the supreme Governor over all Persons, Ecclesiastical as well as Civil: Or if you please, we own our Kings and Queens too to be the supreme Civil Governors, or external Heads of the Church, under God, to protect and defend her, and see that her Bishops and Priests do their Duties, to which God hath called and appointed them in the Church; and to coerce them by Civil Censures and Punishments, when they fail in their Duty; and to make the Canons of the Church, when they please, Statutes of the Realm, and to exact Laws for the external Regulation of Religion, as *Constantine*, the first Christian Emperor did; who therefore called himself the *external Bishop* of the Church in the *Roman Empire*. And if any of our Princes chance, at any time, to assume a greater Power and Authority in Matters Ecclesiastical than is meet, Sovereign Princes and States, within the Pale of your Church, often

often have done, and still will do the same. How many struggles have there been in the *German Empire*, betwixt the Popes and the Emperors ; and in *France*, between the Pontificate and the most Christian Crown ? I am sure most of the Nations within the Pope's Spiritual Power groan under his Usurpations, and have much more reason to be called *Pontifical States*, than ours hath to be mis-called by you a Parliamentary, or a Regal-Church. But to be short, *Sir*, we neither allow our Kings and Parliaments, or any Civil Sovereignty upon Earth, Power to make or unmake a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, or to preach the Word, administer the Holy Sacrament, or exercise the Power of the Keys, to which, according to our Church, Princes are subject as well as private Men, or to take that honour to themselves as to do any sacerdotal Act. But they have power to restrain the exercise of sacerdotal Acts in the Ministers of the Church by Temporal Penalties ; in which case it is always the unalienable Right of the Church-Governors to judge, whether they can with a good Conscience submit to those restraining Acts, or patiently undergo the Penalties, when they cannot. You cannot deny but there are cases wherein they may, and ought to submit, and others wherein they ought not. In a word, *Sir*, the Church and State, or Ecclesiastical and Civil Society, hath each a Power or Authority for Edification, to help, assist, and preserve the other ; but no Power of Destruction, to hurt, annoy, or pull down one another, or of Usurpation to go beyond the Bounds God hath severally set them ; or invade one another's Fundamental Rights.

You are wont to speak many things magnificently of your Church to draw our People to her, as that she was before the Scriptures of the New Testa-

ment; which may be true of the first planted Dioceſan Church at *Rome*; and ſo many other Churches were before the Scriptures, as that of *Hieruſalem* and *Antioch*, which were planted before the Church of *Rome*. In like manner are you wont to boaſt of her Extent and Univerſality, as the *Spaniards* do of their Monarchy, in which they ſay the Sun never ſets; and yet other Kingdoms of leſs Compaſs and Extent have all that belongs to Sovereignty, and all the Royal Honours and Maſteſty that belong to crown'd Heads, as well as the King of *Spain*. To what purpoſe then do you tell us, that the High Maſs is ſaid in one place or other of the World in every one of the Twenty Four Hours, ſince you cannot deny by your own Principles, but that ſhe was as holy, true Catholick and Apoſtolick Church, when ſhe was confined to a much leſſer Pale; and would be ſo, though ſhe were reduced to her firſt narrow Limits, ſo as to have her High Maſs ſaid but in one Hour of the Day. Sir, at this way of arguing for the Glory of your Church, the *Jews* may, and do boaſt of theirs; who notwithstanding all the Kings and Potentates of the Earth, are either their Enemies, or not their Friends, yet they have a Name and People over all the World; and there is ſcarce an Hour of the Natural Day, in which their Synagogues in one Country or other, are not open for Divine Worſhip. There is not any Country in Chriſtendom, nor in the *Turks* or grand *Mogul's* Dominions, where there are not *Jews*, nor a *Roman* Catholick Countrey; not *Italy*, or *Rome* it ſelf excepted, where there are not *Jewiſh* Diſperſions, though they neither have, nor can have a Foot of Land in any Nation. And this makes them boaſt, like you, that they are ſtill the Church, ſtill the Peculiar People of God, and that his ſpecial Preſence is now as much among them, as when he made it manifeſt to their Senſes in the *Wilderneſs*, in a cloudy Pillar by Day, and in the Night

Night by a Pillar of Fire, or by his Glory in the Temple. But, *Sir*, after all your boasting, the *Greek* Church though perhaps it is not so much scatter'd and dispers'd as yours about the World, yet it hath a much greater number of Souls in its Communion, as learned Men tell me; and if the Emperor and most Christian King, * the great Pillars of your Church, should fall off from it, which they may do, as well as the Kings of *England* have done, then the narrow Pale of our Church, which you despise, would be as wide, and her external Glory as great as that of yours.

Another thing you are wont to object against the Church of *England*, when you go about to proselyte her Children from her, is, that she is in Communion with no other Church; which I know at first hearing often shocks weak People, and makes them suspect, when you flourish upon that Topick, that she is a Church by her self, and like an Island, is divided from the whole Continent of the Universal Church. But, *Sir*, there lurks a Fallacy, as our Divines have shewed me, in this Argument; for, First, the Church of *England*, tho' a single National Church, yet is a Collection of many Churches in Communion with one another, viz. of two famous Provincial, and six and Twenty large Diocesan Churches; which would better appear to vulgar apprehensions to be so many distinct, co-ordinate Sister Churches, were *England*, as it once was, under different independent Sovereignties, and *Wales* a distinct Kingdom independent of the rest. But, Secondly, This great collective Church of *England*, or rather Church in *England* is in Communion with seve-

* Chariss. in Christo filios nostros *Carolus* Romanum imperatorum, & Christianiss. R. *Franciscum*, duo prapipua Christiani, nominis firmamenta, atque subsidia orare, atque obsecrare institimus. *Bulla Indiæ. sacri Oecum. Conc. Trid. sub Paulo 3. Pont. Max.*

ral other National Churches, as that of *Scotland*, *Ireland*, and *Man*, which as I said before, would better appear to be so many distinct, independent National Churches, were they under distinct independent Sovereigns, as the Churches of *France*, *Spain*, and *Portugal* are ; and therefore it is a great mistake to say, that the Church of *England* is in Communion with no other Church ; for she is in Communion with all those Churches, and in a state of as strict Union with them, as the particular Church of *Rome*, of which the Pope is Bishop, is with all the Churches of her Communion ; only with this difference, that she doth not pretend to be the Mother, and Mistress, and Head of them, and Principle of Unity to them, as the Diocesan Church of *Rome* doth with great Arrogance and Presumption ; which were she never so Pure and Primitive in all other respects, would be a just cause, for which all other Churches ought to refuse Communion with her, because they cannot be in Communion with her without being in absolute Subjection to her ; no, nor allowed to be Catholick Churches but by Agreement and Participation with her, which is *causally* the Catholick Church, and makes all others in her Communion to be such. She is also, as I am told, in actual Communion and Correspondence with a reformed Episcopal Church in *Poland* ; and that with her, and in Heart, Will, and Desire, she is in Communion with all truly Catholick Churches, wheresoever dispers'd over the Face of the Earth. In the second place, this Objection against the Church of *England* collectively taken for her, and all other Churches in her Communion, may be retorted on the Church of *Rome*, taken collectively for the particular Church of *Rome*, and all the other Churches in Communion with her. For in this *collective* Sense the Church of *Rome* is in Communion with no other Church in the World ; not
with

with the Patriarchal Church of *Greece*, or any Member of it, nor with any of the Oriental Patriarchal Churches, nor with the Church in the *Abyssin Ethiopia*, but stands by her self as much as the Church of *England* doth: So that by consequence the Reflection you are wont to make upon the Church of *England*, for not being in Communion with any other Church, were it truly such, touches your Church as much as ours. But in the third place, let us suppose that *France* and *Spain*, and the residue of the Empire should fall off from your Church, as several other Kingdoms have done; nay, let us suppose that all other Churches in Communion with the Diocesan Church of *Rome* should depart from her Communion, would she be less Catholick in this solitary State than she was before, or rather would she cease to be the Catholick Church, when she was left to her self. You dare not answer in the Affirmative, because you say she is causally called Catholick, making other Churches to be Catholick when they agree, and participate in Doctrine and Communion with her. If then in that solitary State, when she would be in Communion with no other Church, she would still be the Catholick Church, why should you object, as a Reproach and Dishonour to the Church of *England*, yea, and urge it as an Argument against her, that she is in Communion with no other Church? Methinks your learned Priests at least should forbear this Objection, which how popular soever they may think it, they cannot but know is very weak.

You have also told me, that we allow you may be saved, but that you cannot allow us any hopes of Salvation. It is true, *Sir*, we do not only allow, but pray you may be saved: But then tho' we say you may be sav'd, yet it is at best with very great Difficulty, Pains, and Hazard of your Salvation,

that we make such allowances for you: And we make them not upon the account of those things wherein you differ from us, for therein lieth your great danger, but upon the score of those Fundamental Truths which you retain, and hold with us; and for the Belief of those, we hope, as many among you, who do not know they are in Error, I mean the invincibly Ignorant, may find Mercy from God, who makes allowances for the unwilling Mistakes of Men, in the great Day; when as I am inclin'd to hope, his Mercy, which is as infinite as his Majesty, may do for some well-meaning Heathens and Jews.

But for my own part, as God in Mercy hath given me clear sight of all the Errors and Corruptions of your Church; so for fear of partaking of her Sins, I dare abide no longer in her Communion, and with Sorrow and contrition of Heart I bewail my Misfortune, and humble my self in the sight of God for not discerning them sooner. But I trust he hath accepted my Repentance for my sinful Blindness and Rashness in leaving the Church of *England* in her Distress; the Catholick Church of *England*, as she deserves to be called, because she derives her Doctrine and Ministry from the Apostles. Wo is me! I left her by your persuation in her Sorrow, when the Lord had afflicted her, in the Day of her Mourning, when her Priests sighed, and her Virgins were afflicted for her; but now, I hope, there is Joy in Heaven for my Repentance and return to her, and in her to the Catholick Church. I know you impute my return, which you call Apostacy, to my Husband, and charge him with it, and the Ruine of my Soul. I must confess I love him truly, and passionately, as I conceive it to be my Duty; but I hope I love God, and my Salvation more; and I am sure he loves not God so little, nor any worldly Interest so much,

much, as to persuade me to any thing he thought would hurt my Soul, though he might Gain the whole World by it. His Sighs, Tears, Prayers, laborious Studies, and indefatigable Pains for my Conversion, all witness this Truth to me. And in all his proceedings with me, he never went about by Fallacy or Force, to reduce me, but indeavour'd to rectify my Errors by fair, rational, and gentle Christian Methods, with all Tendernefs and Discretion, as well as continual Care and Diligence to convince me that I was in the Wrong. It was he that first taught me to compare the Faith, and Worship, and Discipline of the Church of *England*, with the Faith, Worship, and Discipline of your Church; and upon setting them in one view together to judge which looked most like Primitive and Pure. Nay, as there scarce ever was any Church without some Faults and Defects, he bid me set whatever I thought amiss in the Church of *England*, against the Faults I began to discern in your Church, and then to judge impartially, which I thought had the fewest and least. He also put into my Hands the controversial Books of the ablest and clearest *English* Writers, in Defence of the Church of *England* against her Adversaries of your Church: And as I took time to try and examine all things, so I make no doubt but I have chosen the best. He also brought me acquainted with the best Divines of the Church of *England*, which our Parts afford, by whom I profited very much, and by those means, and God's blessing upon them, he happily accomplish'd my Conversion. Sir, from this short account of it, I hope it will appear to you, that it was not my love to him, but to Truth, and the God of Truth, that made me return to my first Mother; in which I did no more than the great Mr. *Chillingworth*, and many other seduced and sincere lovers of Truth have done.

From what I have here declared, dear Sir, unto you, you will perceive, that I am no longer to be frighted with the terrible charge of Heresy and Schism, which you so freely and precariously lay upon our Church, and those who are safe and happy, as I believe my self to be, in her Communion. You cannot shew us any one thing, which we profess or practise, for which we are justly chargeable with Heresy or Schism. We profess the same Faith, and no other, as I have said, than that which the Church of *Rome*, and all other Churches taught and professed for the first six Hundred Years: and we hold Communion with all Churches whatsoever, or wheresoever they are, that are true and faithful Members of the Catholick Church: And it is only for not communicating with yours in things that are not Catholick and Apostolick, that she imputes Heresy and Schism to us, of which she her self is of all others most guilty. You say we are gone off from the Catholick Church, by which you still precariously and absurdly mean your own Church. But pray, Sir, consider, did we first go off from you, or you from us? Or if the Separation was on our side, did we divide from you any farther, than our Divines have shewed, you have divided in Doctrine, Worship, and Ecclesiastical Polity from the ancient Catholick Church? You have departed as much from that in all, and every one of those respects, as we have departed from you; and our returning to it, and reforming according to its Doctrines and Practice, is that which you call departing from your Church. Let God, the Judge of all the Earth, judge between you and us, who will judge us both at the last Day. We appeal to his Tribunal against you, and in the mean time to a truly Free, and General Council, when such a one can be had. In particular, we appeal to the *Greek Church*, and all the

the Churches of the East, and will be determined and concluded by them, as to the Point of your Churches being the Mother and Mistress of all other Churches, and the Supremacy of her Bishop, as Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar General of Jesus Christ. *Sir*, these two Points, as false as they are, are the Vitals of Popery, and have been the Source of all Mischief and Misery to Christendom, and will for ever make your Church a Schismatick from the whole Catholick Church. You see, *Sir*, how much I have alter'd my Notions upon conversing with the dead and living Divines of the Church of *England*, and I beseech you let it not trouble you, that I am thus changed. Upon me be all the Peril of my departure; you have done what you could to prevent it, and I heartily thank you for your well intended Care of me, and all the Pains you took with me, by which I acknowledge, in some respects, you have improved me, and made me more knowing, pious, and devout. And to conclude; I assure you I shall depart in nothing from the Church of *Rome*, as some do, out of pure Prejudice, Humour, or Aversion, for no other Reason, but because she doth so or so. No, *Sir*, what is truly ancient and apostolick and safe, and worthy of Imitation in her, I shall hold, and maintain, and endeavour to practise the more, because she hath retained it, and is right and Orthodox therein. And among Protestants, as we are called, for protesting against your Innovations, I love and honour those most, who are of this healing, peaceful, meek Temper, and think them the properest Persons to gain and proselyte *your* People, and of all others fittest to be Reconcilers. But as for those Gentlemen who are so narrow, and peevish, as to call every thing Popery, and every Man Papist, they do not Like; I think them, let their meaning be never so good, to be an unhappy sort

of Christians; who out of an indiscreet Zeal dis-
serve the true Interests of Christianity and the Re-
formation; and though contrary to their intenti-
ons, yet are unhappy Instruments of doing much
Harm to the Holy Catholick Church. I am sure no
general Peace and Union is to be expected among
Christians, while Men of this Temper govern the
Affairs of Religion. I pray God ever to keep me
in a contrary disposition to them, and I beseech
you, *Sir*, to believe, that though I have left your
Communion upon the Motives and Reasons ex-
pressed in this Letter, yet I will ever be in all Sin-
cerity, and with all good Will,

Your most faithful Friend

and Servant.

SOME

SOME
Q U E R I E S

Sent by a
Roman Catholick to a *Divine* of
the *Church of England*; With
his ANSWER to them.

The Q U E R I E S.

I Should be glad to know, if it can be deny'd, but that the Church of Rome was once a most Pure, Excellent, Flourishing, and Mother Church; and it seems to be acknowledg'd by several learned Authors, and also by King James in his Speech to the Parliament.

This Church could not cease to be such, but she must fall either by Apostacy, Heresy, or Schism. Apostacy is not only a renouncing of the Faith of Christ, but the very Name and Title to Christianity. No Man will say that the Church of Rome had ever such a fall, or fell thus.

Heresy is an adhesion to some private and singular Opinion, or Error in Faith, contrary to the general approved Doctrine of the Church.

If

If the Church of Rome did ever adhere to any singular or new Opinion, disagreeable to the common receiv'd Doctrine of the Christian World; pray satisfy me as to these particulars.

1. By what General Council was she ever condemned?
2. Which of the Fathers once writ against her?
3. By what Authority was she otherwise reprov'd?

For it seems to me to be a thing very incongruous, that so great a Church should be condemn'd by every one that hath a mind to condemn her.

Schism is a departure or division from the Unity of the Church, whereby the Band and Communion held with some former Church is broken and dissolved.

If the Church of Rome divided her self by Schism from any other body of faithful Christians, or brake Communion, or went forth from the Society of any elder Church: I pray satisfy me as to these particulars.

1. Whose Company did she leave?
2. From what body did she go forth?
3. Where was the true Church which she forsook?

It appears strange that a Church should be accounted Schismatical, when there cannot be assigned any other Church different from her, which from Age to Age, since Christ's time; hath continued visible, from whence she departed?

The ANSWER.

THIS Stuff put in a new Dress, hath for the whole Matter of it been answer'd a hundred times over, but if they should take notice of our Answers, it would spoil their Trade; they therefore resolve to pursue their old Artifice in laying down the same seeming Doubts, or sophistical Proposals with a little variation of Method, and with them to set upon well-disposed, but unskilful Persons, and commonly upon such as are young, and of an unsteady, and over inquisitive Temper. Now though
it

it be neither ingenuous nor fair, thus to pass over our Arguments in silence, and looks like holding the Conclusion in spite of the Premises, yet that I may, as much as in me lies, prevent others from hazarding their Souls, by going off from a Pure to a most corrupt and dangerous Communion, I shall for once take upon me this unreasonable Task, and answer this busy *Romanist* in every Particular. And thus he begins.

I should be glad to know if it can be deny'd, but that the Church of Rome was once a most Pure, Excellent, Flourishing, and Mother Church; and it seems to be acknowledged by several learned Authors, and also by King James in his Speech to the Parliament.

Resp. Our concern is not so much to know, what the Church of *Rome* was at first, as what it is now; for if she prove bad now, instead of an advantage, it will rather be a Reproach and Dishonour to her to have been so good in former Times. It is an uncomfortable saying, *How is the faithful City become an Harlot?* But not to deny them any Pretensions which carry the face of Truth, I am as ready as any of his learned Authors, or King James himself, to acknowledge, that the Church of *Rome* was once a glorious Member of the Catholick Church. But I must except against one thing in his description of her, wherein he calls her *Mother Church*, as if the Rise and Beginning of all Churches was from her, and wherein he would slyly insinuate the belief of that manifest Falshood no less than thrice foysted into the determination of the Council of *Trent*, that she is *Omnium Ecclesiarum Mater & Magistra*, i. e. The Mother and Mistress of all Churches; whereas we were grafted into the *Jewish* Stock, and the sound of the Apostles went out into all the World from *Jerusalem*, and there was the first *Christian Church*; and *Rome* was not only later than her, but than several others, and if any can be called properly

properly the Mother Church, it must be that of *Jerusalem*. But to do him all the right I can, if by Mother Church he will be content to mean no more than *Tertullian* doth by his *Matrices Ecclesie*, such as *Antioch*, *Ephesus*, *Corinth*, and others planted by the Apostles themselves, I will grant her to have been a Mother Church in the Sense that they were, though it is certain some of them were before her : But now she is much changed from what she was then by Corruption, both in Doctrine and Practice; and unless she can justify the doing Evil, when she thinks good may come of it, whose Damnation the Apostle saith is just, (*Rom. 3. 8.*) I see not how she can vindicate her self in sending forth her Emissaries, to put on all Shapes to create numerous Sects and Divisions, to instil Enthusiastical Notions, to preach and argue among Presbyterians, Independants, Anabaptists, Quakers, and what not; and to poison them with Notions contrary to the true Hierarchy, Doctrine, and Discipline of the Church. For at this rate, instead of being a *Mother Church*, she looks more like what *St. John* calls the *Mother of Harlots*, *Revel. 17. 5.* But this Querist thinks he hath got a quirk to acquit her of these and all other Crimes; and though he takes too much upon him in imposing upon others what way of Proof they shall proceed in, yet I will follow him in his own way. And thus he proceeds.

This Church could not cease to be such, but she must fall either by Apostacy, Heresy, or Schism. Apostacy is not only a renouncing of the Faith of Christ, but the very Name and Title to Christianity. No Man will say, that the Church of Rome had ever such a fall, or fell thus.

Resp. Far be it from me to accuse her, or any other Church, of more than they are guilty of; I had much rather there were no cause for any accusation at all; And since it is granted, that the
proof

proof of any one of the Three is sufficient to carry the Cause against her, I am willing to drop this first; and I pray God preserve her and all other Churches from Apostacy, to prevent which it may become us often to call to mind that of the Apostle, *Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall*, 1 Cor. 10. 12. For the Church of Rome, as a particular Church, hath no better security against a total falling away, than had the *Asiatick* Churches mentioned in the *Revelations*, which are all gone, or the *African* Churches, which though now lost, were once a more eminent Pattern of Christian Simplicity, Humility, and Piety, than her contemporary Church of Rome, though then of great Reputation. She ought not therefore to be so proud and scornful, as to despise those who advise her to beware, lest those foul Corruptions cherished in her, and abetted by her, should, by the just Judgment of God, have a tendency in time even to Apostacy: But let this pass, that we may come to the next; which he sets down thus.

Heresy is an adhesion to some private and singular Opinion or Error in Faith, contrary to the general approved Doctrine of the Church.

If the Church of Rome did ever adhere to any singular or new Opinion, disagreeable to the common receiv'd Doctrine of the Christian World: Pray satisfy me as to these particulars.

1. *By what General Council was she ever condemn'd?*

2. *Which of the Fathers ever wrote against her?*

3. *By what Authority was she otherwise reprov'd?*

For it seems to me to be a thing very incongruous, that so great a Church should be condemned by every one that hath a mind to condemn her.

Resp. His account or definition of Heresy seems to me to be too narrow, for not only Errors in Faith, but such as are founded upon Principles utterly inconsistent with and destructive of a good Life, may come within the Notion of Heresy:

And

And I doubt not but my Adversary is so well skill'd in Antiquity, as to be able to produce several by the Ancients condemned as such; but I shall only make a later instance, wherein I think we are all agreed, I mean, the *Bohemian Adamites*, who made a Religion of going Naked: This on all sides hath been accounted a shameless Heresy, and I think very justly, although we had had nothing else against them. And I must crave leave to tell you, that there are many allowed Opinions and Practices in the *Roman Church*, which are far from being encouragers of Christian Piety and holy Living. Their Rates set upon Sins, their Pardons, their Purgatory, and way of praying out of it, with several others things, smell rank of Fraud and Cheat, encourage Men to Sin and neglect Repentance, and border so nearly upon Heresy, that they ought at least to be condemned as pernicious Errors. But I doubt not but upon farther search, the *Roman Church* will furnish us with some plain manifest Heresy; but then he will be answered in his way; for if I accuse her of Heresy, he asks me

1. *By what General Council was she ever condemned?*

Resp. Is then nothing Heresy but what is condemned by a General Council? Surely Heresy is a thing certain in its own nature, and antecedent to the sentence or determination of any Council whatsoever; and a Doctrine is not therefore Heresy, because the Council condemned it, but therefore the Council condemned it because it was Heresy, and thereby publicly notified and declared it to be so, that all might avoid it: And upon this account not only a General but any particular Council or Church might condemn it, otherwise she hath not a Power to provide for the security of her own Members; and indeed without it she hath not a Power, nor so much as a Right to preserve her self. Seeing then Heresy is Heresy, whether condemned by
a Gene-

a General Council or not, let us see how the Church of *Rome* will acquit her self of Heresy; and here I shall begin with the universal Pastorship, which by the Primitive Church was reserved to Christ, who is only capable of it, the Doctrine of any other universal Head was not then so much as thought of: The first who openly set up for it was *John of Constantinople*, nor did he pretend to it by a Divine Right, but from the Authority of the Emperor: This the Pride and Ambition of *Rome* could not bear, as indeed there was no reason for it, had she been never so meek and humble: But the *Constantinopolitans* only beat the Bush, the *Romanists* caught the Bird. For when *Phocas* murder'd his Royal Master and usurp'd his Throne, *Boniface* then Bishop of *Rome*, struck in with him, and got this sweet Morsel to himself out of the Mouth of the *Constantinopolitan*; so then this glorious Title in its first rise is not only owing to a Secular Power, but to Parricide, Rebellion and Treason. But to let that pass, let us see what was the judgment of a Pope of *Rome* in this case, which any one should think would go a great way with our Adversaries. When this attempt was first made, *Gregory the Great* was Bishop or Pope of *Rome*, who oppos'd it with all his Might, and with such Arguments as unanswerably prove it competible to no mere Man: It would be tedious to mention them, and therefore for brevity's sake I shall only observe one Inference he makes from them; *In isto scelesto vocabulo consentire nihil est aliud quam fidem cedere, i. e.* That to agree to that wicked Title is nothing else but to give up the Faith. And if that be not Heresy I know not what is. And if it be considered how vastly that Power is stretch'd and extended to the irreparable damage of Christ's Church, beyond what it was then when not so much as pretended to: If a Pope thought it Heresy then, it ought to be judged much more so now. Another thing

thing which I know not how to acquit of Heresy, is their establishment of the Worship of Images. When the second Council of *Nice* determin'd in favour of this Worship, it set the Western World on fire; the Council of *Frankfort* opposed it self against them; the *British* Church cry'd out horribly against them; *Alcuinus*, Preceptor to *Charlemaine*, wrote learnedly against them; and Pope *Gregory* himself, though he would seem to mitigate and take up the Controversy, yet in the same Breath condemns not only the *Iconoclasts*, but also those of *Nice*. For thus he writes to *Severus*; *Tua ergo Fraternitas, & illas (i. e. Images) servare, & ab earum adoratione populum prohibere debuit*; You ought to save the Images, but to forbid the People to worship them. But notwithstanding this out-cry in the West, the determination of a Council, and the declar'd judgment of the Pope himself, the Council of *Trent* have determin'd for the Worship of Images: For their direction is to uncover the Head and fall prostrate before them (*Sess. 25.*) And the *Catechismus ad Parochas*, set out by their Order, directs the Priest to instruct the People in respect of their Behaviour towards Images, *ut colantur*, that they be worshipped. Their various shifts and their several degrees of Worship, will not excuse; as good distinctions may be found in *Maximus Tyrius*, *Hierocles*, and other Heathen Authors, for the different Worship of their *Dii majorum & minorum Gentium*. That which I desire to know is, whether it be not a religious Worship they pay? If not, why is it determined by their Councils? Why among their divine Offices? Why so solemnly pay'd in their Churches? But if it be a religious Worship, it is robbing God of that Glory which he hath said he will not give to another: And if religious Worship be not appropriated to God, what shall be left him among Men? And therefore if Council, or Pope, or any other, require me to
worship

worship religiously any thing but God, I think the same answer may serve Him or Them, which our Blessed Saviour gave to the Devil, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve, Matth. 4. 10.* I have many other considerable Matters to lay to her charge, which for brevity sake I omit at present, that I may hasten to his second Question: For they must be humour'd, and we bound to take the course they prescribe. The Question is,

2. *Which of the Fathers ever writ against her (i. e. the Church of Rome?)*

Resp. I ever had a great Reverence for the Fathers, and do think, that by their great Wisdom and Experience they might be able to make a better guess at the tendency of things, than most other Men; but I never understood that they were Prophets, which they must be upon this Proposition, for else how can it be expected, that they who were dead above a thousand Years since, should write against the Church of *Rome*? Or if they had been Prophets, yet it must be made appear that they were endued with the Spirit of Prophecy, as to this particular, which I never yet heard any assert. But though they thought not of her, yet if in their Writings may be found many Matters which are inconsistent with several Doctrines of the present Church of *Rome*; then I doubt not but in this Sense they may be said to have written against her. Thus to continue our former instances, the universal Headship was unknown to them, and the contrary Doctrine appears from them: I grant indeed, that the Bishop of *Rome* being placed in the Seat of the Empire, must in course be a Man of greater Interest and Business than most other Men, and consequently that upon several occasions greater application might be made to him: But as for his Episcopal Authority, it was no more in its Nature than what other Men had, yet it was the very same

M

which

which they all did partake of; nor did they account him any other than their Colleague or Fellow-Bishop; and even as low as St. *Jerome's* time, that Father levels the Authority of the Bishop of *Rome* with that of *Engubium*, an obscure Place. Their Cities might be large, or the extent of their Jurisdiction greater, but their Authority and the Jurisdiction it self was the same; as the Bishop of *Bangor* is as much a Bishop as the Bishop of *London*, *Paris*, or *Constantinople*. This was the judgment of the Fathers as to Bishops, but how this can be reconciled to that absolute uncontrollable Power which the Pope challengeth over all Bishops, and all Churches, is past my skill. Had he talk'd then of the plenitude of his Power, or of deposing Bishops, Kings and Princes at his pleasure, they would all have risen up against him as one Man; as their Writings remain a plain Evidence against his present exorbitant and monstrous Pretensions. If we proceed to the other instance of Image-Worship, if the Fathers did not write directly against what was not then introduced, yet have they enough in them to condemn the introducing of it: For some time no Images at all were allowed in Churches; and this was, say some of, even our Adversaries *ob metum Idololatriæ*, for fear of Idolatry. But what Idolatry could they be afraid of in the Use of them, other than the worshipping of them? But when afterwards the Historical Use of them was allowed, all Persons were carefully caution'd against the Worship of them, as being no better in the Matter of it than Idolatry; yet now it is made a necessary Business, if not an Article of Faith: Who would not venture his Soul in such Company? The same thing, may be, he would require, as to the mangling the Sacrament, and ask me which of the Fathers wrote against it? And yet by their own Confession, it was above a thousand Years since Christ's time, before that Usage was brought in:

And

And doubtless it never enter'd into the Heads of the Fathers, that any would ever be so audacious as to attempt any such thing against Christ's own Institution; especially if we consider, that the virtue of the Sacrament depends upon Christ's Institution, and to make it another thing than he instituted seems to destroy the very Sacrament. In things of this nature, if we expect the Benefit, we must stick close to the Institution; I fear they will find but small Comfort, who frame concomitancies by violating the command, and it will puzzle him to prove it not to be a better consequence, that an half Sacrament is no Sacrament. But I forbear to proceed farther, that I may come to his third Question.

By what Authority was she (the Church of Rome) otherwise reprov'd?

Resp. Considering what hath been already said, I think this Question might be neglected as needless, but least he should think we are quite destitute of Authority, I will tell him who reprov'd her. The Church of *Rome* stands by the Council of *Trent*, and as soon as it was discover'd how that tricking Council proceeded, it alarm'd almost all the Nations and Churches in *Europe*; the *Spanish* Bishops, especially the brave Archbishop of *Granata*, complained of foul Play, and being overuled in the Council, though otherwise strong Papists, and were countenanc'd by their King. Be pleas'd to read the Letter of *Andreas Dudithius*, Bishop of *Five Churches*, to the Emperor *Maximilian* the 2d. and there he will tell you what cause there was to reprove them, and amongst other things he signifies to this effect, That though the force of the Council was at *Trent*, yet their determinations were made in the Conclave; and if the Waters happen'd to be up they were forc'd to wait till the Holy Ghost was sent them from *Rome* in a Cloak-Bag. Monsieur de *Lansac*, the *French* Ambassador,

then Resident in the Council, writes to the King his Master, That the Pope was so much Master of the Council, that his Pensioners, whatsoever the Emperor's Ambassadors or he did remonstrate unto them, they would do what they list. The Emperor *Charles* the 5th, was once so enraged against them that he threatned to have the Cardinal Legate, *Croce*, thrown into the River. The Protestants *Santa* were indeed invited by a mock *safe Conduct*, but they were fore-judg'd unheard; for they would not admit them as Parties, but Criminals; they were not suffer'd to debate, but to reconcile, and that upon unconscionable Terms. The whole *Gallican* Church expressed their dissatisfaction as to that Council, and whatever they have done since did refuse to admit it, saving in that one Article of Clandestine Marriages. When Signior *Scipio*, a *Venetian* Gentleman, by Letter, ask'd Bishop *Jewel* why *England* alone neither sent any Ambassador to the Council, or by any Message excus'd her absence; he lets him know his Mistake by another Question, asking him, Where were the Ambassadors of the King of *Denmark*, of the Princes of *Germany*, of the King of *Sweden*, of the *Switzers*, of the *Grisons*, of the *Hanse-Towns*, of the Realm of *Scotland*, of the Dukedom of *Prussia*? Here is a fine Company (besides others which he mentions) who either flatly rejected it, or resolv'd to take no notice of it. And when you can make all these to signify nothing, then you may persuade me that they were not reproved by any Authority otherwise. As to what you say, of her being condemn'd by every one that hath a mind to condemn her, we neither approve of Busy-bodies nor Censoriousness; but if in vindication of our own Church we are forc'd to condemn yours, you may thank your selves, who give us the just Provocation: And if some Men are too forward that way, you of all Men have least reason to complain, because

cause every little pragmatistical Member of your Church, without Provocation, will condemn others in a more petulant, violent, and indecent manner than any of ours do so by you. I come now to the Third and last Branch, which he sets down thus.

Schism is a departure or division from the Unity of the Church, whereby the Bond and Communion held with some former Church is broken and dissolved.

If the Church of Rome divided her self by Schism from any other body of faithful Christians, or brake Communion, or went forth from the Society of any elder Church: I pray satisfy me as to these particulars.

1. *Whose Company did she leave?*
2. *From what body did she go forth?*
3. *Where was the true Church which she forsook?*

It appears strange that a Church should be accounted Schismatical, when there cannot be assigned any other Church different from her, which from Age to Age, since Christ's time; hath continued visible, from whence she departed?

Resp. I shall not concern my self about his Description of Schism, but I cannot but observe, that these Men will not forbear their captious Terms; for why should he require us to prove, that she went forth from the Society of an Elder Church? For be the Church Elder or Younger, if she be True and Orthodox, if you renounce her Communion without just cause, it will make you guilty of Schism: But if that will do him any kindness I think it no hard matter to prove, that she went off from an Elder Church: In order to which I shall answer his first Question, which in effect answer all the Three.

Whose Company did she leave?

Resp. She not only leaves, but insolently condemns, and what in her lies, damns all the Christian Churches in the World, except those of her own Communion; and even some of those she hath no great love for, but is forc'd to connive at their

maintaining some honest doctrinal Points which she is highly displeased with, but dares not put them under Censure for fear a Revolt should overturn her Grandeur. And indeed the Matters wherein she differs from us are generally such as make for the support of her Pride, Profit and Ambition, to the great Dishonour and Damage of the Christian Cause. Doth she leave no Company when she condemns no less than the Three great Patriarchates of *Constantinople*, *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, of which *Antioch* was most certainly a Church before her? Must the *Grecian*, *Armenian*, *Egyptian*, *Indian* and *Habassinian* Churches pass for no Company, because she will suffer them to be no Company for her? And indeed the *Habassinian* Church, according to the account we have of it, hath Ten times more of Christian Simplicity in it than the Church of *Rome* can pretend to. But to leave other Churches to take care of themselves, it was the Church of *Rome*, which not only left us, but unjustly condemn'd us, and forbid all Communion with us; when *Pius V.* by his Bull, as insolently as falsely declar'd us to be *à Christi Corporis unitate praeisfos*, i. e. cut off from the Unity of the Body of Christ. In which Bull, if you please to observe the unlimited Power and prodigious Titles he assumes to himself, you must think that either he thought himself little less than a God, or that he was madder than ever Man was in Bedlam.

Any impartial indifferent Person would now think it needless to say any thing to the other two Questions; but because they are apt to make a great Matter of nothing, and Triumph if every Trifle be not taken notice of, I shall briefly answer them; the first of which is this,

From what Body did she go forth?

Resp. To go forth from a Body is not properly said of every Schism, where a particular Church breaks in pieces, and one part separates from the other,

other, there the Criminal part may be said to go out from the Sound; but where Two particular Churches fall off from Communion with each other, there they being Two distinct Bodies, the one cannot be said properly to go forth from the other Body, but the Schism is made by refusing Communion to and with each other; and that Church is the guilty Party, and properly the Schismatick, which was the Cause of the Breach. And this is the present Case, and the Church of *Rome* is the guilty Party, not only for condemning us unjustly, but for requiring such Terms of, and Qualifications for Communion, as are inconsistent with our Christian Duty, which hath been in a good measure proved, and might be farther in many more instances. His last Question is this.

Where was the true Church, which she forsook?

Resp. Ours was a true Church, which she forsook, and it is a Church founded on Catholick Principles, and so far is in Communion with all the Catholick Churches that are, or ever were. And have I not already named many other Churches which she hath forsaken? Are none of them true Churches? Are none of them baptiz'd in Christ's Name? Do not they profess themselves Christians? Have they not Bishops for the Governors of their Churches? And all these are neither Phantoms nor Goblins, but visible Christians; and I think make as visible Churches as any others. And though the matter depends not upon the long continuance, but the Orthodoxy of Churches, yet some of them have continued as long, and others longer than she. And as for this Island, there hath been all along a Church in it, and if it was planted by any of the Apostles, as some of their own Authors endeavour to prove, by the *Britains* Observation of *Easter*, it seems to be of earlier Conversion than the Church of *Rome*. And thus you may see it is a vain brag, when he saith, That there can-

not be assigned any other Church different from her, which from Age to Age, since Christ's time, hath continued visible; though in strict speaking, none of them have continued from Christ's time; for excepting the Church of *Jerusalem*, none of them were planted till a considerable time after Christ's Ascension, and the Church of *Rome* as late as most of them: And whatever she was in the beginning, it is apparent from what hath been said, that she is now a Corrupt, Heretical, and Schismatical Church, which I take to be no encouragement for any Man, who hath any value for his Soul, to go into her Communion, much less to forsake a true Orthodox Communion for it.

F I N I S.

APPENDIX.

SIR,

July 28. 1709.

I Have been under a great Indisposition of Body of late, occasion'd chiefly by a great Affliction that has befall'n me, as you may guess by the enclos'd, and believe the Author of that Paper may think it sent as a Judgment upon me, who knowing did not embrace the Love of the Truth in their Way and Terms, which has occasion'd this fresh Attack upon me, which I am so just to my self and you as to communicate to you, desiring your Advice by the first Post what Answer to return to it; I am far from a Desire of changing, if I may be sure of being safe in the way I am, otherways I will run all Hazards of Body and Estate rather than hazard the Welfare of my Soul. Sir, the former Concern you have express'd for me makes me believe you will not be wanting in assisting me at this time, who am,

Your assured Friend.

MADAM,

YOUR Ladyship does me great Justice in the Opinion you have of my real Concern for you, and therefore I can't doubt but you are sensible of the Part I take in your Affliction, and have only to wish that my Grief could be a Diminution of your Ladyship's; but tho' my Grief added to yours makes not yours the less, yet your Prayer added to mine may do it, and that by frequent Acts of Resignation to the Holy Will of God, That his

Will

Will be done on Earth as it is in Heaven, Amen, Amen, Amen. And in particular the Apostle tells us, *1 Theff. 4. 3. Our Sanctification is the Will of God,* for which we must pray that it be done, done by the Spirit of God in us, and we doing in and with the Divine Spirit; that is to say, God offers to us for our Sanctification Faith, Hope, and Charity, and we to be sanctify'd must by his Grace exercise Faith in him, must hope in him, and love him above all Things. *But how shall we believe unless we hear? How shall we hear without a Preacher? How shall they preach, unless they be sent?* Rom. 10. But sent by whom on Earth as the Vicar of Jesus Christ in all Ages? Evidently by that individual Authority in St. Peter, which, without any Limitation of Time, was commanded to feed the Lambs and Sheep of Christ, *John 21.*

Faith is the first Step to Sanctification, *captivating our Understanding* to the Obedience of Christ, so that without Faith neither Hope nor Charity can be in Man to any Effect of Sanctification, because *without Faith it is impossible to please God,* Heb. 11. 6. But you will say you believe, you have a Preacher, and he is sent, but your *Mistake is, that because* you know some Divine Truths by Human Education you call that Knowledge, *Faith*, and because you hear Men talk of some Divine Truths you call that Preaching, and *they doing this by Act of Parliament* you call this *sent*; whereas by the Words of our blessed Saviour the feeding of all Lambs and all Sheep to the End of the World, without any Limitation to Person, Time, or Place, was to come from the *Authority given to and from the Office enjoin'd St. Peter*, and therefore his Authority and *Office is the Rock on which* Christ has built his Church, against which the Gates of Hell, the Powers of Hell, Errors and Corruptions, shall not prevail, *Matt. Cap. 16.* Wherefore tho' a Man independently of his Authority may come, yet he can't be sent; tho he may
may

may Talk, he can't Preach; for how shall they preach unless they be sent? So that independently of Peter's Authority Faith, Preaching and Sending is all Human, and therefore of no Effect to Sanctification. Pray please to consider that Protestants themselves must allow, That before Luther it was only that Body of Christians in Communion with, and Obedience to the Bishop of Rome, which was the visible Holy Catholick Church; it ever was this great Body that call'd General Councils and condemn'd Heresies; those that separated from this Body were by the Fathers in all Ages accounted Schismatics; this Body of Christians thus united with the Bishop of Rome was never accus'd of Error by any of the Fathers; it never fram'd it self by a Change to Day from what it was Yesterday, whereas all other petty Bodies of Christians came out of the other by a Change. Wherefore pray consider well the Weight of St. Peter's Authority as to believing, preaching, and being sent, without which there's no Divine Faith, and consequently no Divine Hope nor Charity, but what Is is Human, and be the Human never so like to the Divine in outward appearance, yet it is not that, and therefore avails not to our Sanctification, which is the Will of God. Time was you ran well, who hinder'd you not to obey the Truth, Gal. 5. 7. I extreamly compassionate your Loss of so much precious Time, and I beseech God, thro' the Merits of Jesus Christ, our only proper Mediator, to inspire you to redeem the Time, because the Days are evil. Amen JESUS.

MADAM, August 13. 1709.

I Have receiv'd your Ladyship's Letter of July 28. 1709. by which I perceive you are still unsettled, and keep Correspondence with the Person who would pervert you. You intimate to me as if you believ'd he thought the Affliction you mention to have been sent as a Divine Judgment upon you for knowing,

*knowing, and yet not embracing the Love of the Truth in their Way; but, Madam, that which you call Truth in their Way is all Error, new Error, gross Error, and most of it damnable Error, in Doctrine, Worship, and Government, such as Christ and his Apostles never taught, nor the Ancient Fathers ever knew; this, Madam, I assert to you again upon the best of my Knowledge after studying the ancient Church-Writers, and heartily believing that I should be answerable to God for deceiving you, if I asserted a Falsity, or went about to make you believe what to the best of my Understanding I did not believe my self; I have told your Ladyship in my former Letters, that if this Gentleman can prove the Trent-Doctrines relating to Worship, the Supremacy of the Pope, and the Authority of the Church of Rome, as Mother and Mistress of all Churches, to have been the constant and universal Tradition of the Church from the Apostles, and taught as necessary to Salvation, that I would go with you unto the Church of Rome; but, Madam, be assur'd, that whatever he pretends or may boast, neither he nor all the Doctors of that Church can make such Proof, and therefore you have no reason to think your late Affliction was sent upon you as a Judgment for not embracing Truth in their Way, which is, nothing but a Mass of Errors, for which, as I told you, you must be answerable to God from the Moment you are reconcil'd to that Church, which of all others is the most corrupt upon the Face of the Earth. If he, Madam, would make you believe that God hath sent that Affliction upon you for not embracing the Trent-Doctrines, in which he hath instructed you, tell him he ought first to have prov'd that those Doctrines were of God; he made the best Effort he could to prove this in the Paper, which you brought me from him, entituled, *That the Doctrines declar'd by the Council of Trent to be de fide are ancient, &c. in Answer to some Passages in Dr. Geo. Hickes's Book.**

Of

Of this Paper I sent you my Opinion in my Letter of *December 6. 1707.* to which I refer you, and now, for your farther Satisfaction, acquaint you that I have printed a full Answer to that Paper, which I hope will be publish'd in a Month, and give your Ladyship perfect Satisfaction, and that after you have read it you will have no more Apprehensions that God sent the Affliction upon you as a Judgment for not embracing those Errors, which he hath taught you to mis-call Truths. You have more reason to fear, if that Affliction beset you as a Divine Judgment, that it was intended as a Correction and Admonition for hearkning so long to a false Teacher, who, to the great Hazard of your Soul, would draw you from the pure Primitive Faith and Religion of the Church of *England* to the corrupt, mix'd, novel Faith and Religion of the Church of *Rome*; from our Divine to their Human Faith and Traditions; from our true to their false Doctrines; from Doctrines which are necessarily to be believ'd in order to Salvation, to Doctrines which are dangerous to be believ'd, and damnable to be practis'd; in a word, from Doctrines we are to contend for *as once deliver'd to the Saints*, to Doctrines we are to contend against as never deliver'd to them.

Madam, such a Change of Religion, without the extraordinary Mercy of God, who best knows what Allowances to make to Human Infirmities, will be very fatal to you; but you are very safe in continuing in that Religion which you have hitherto profess'd, but sad will be the Account you must make to God if you apostatize from it, and therefore the best Advice I can give you, and for which I will be answerable to God, is to remain stedfast and immovable in your Religion, and to hearken no more to the false Teachers, who would entice you from the Church of *England*, the *Pure Reform'd Church of England*, to that most corrupt one of *Rome*.

With my Answer to the Paper herein mention'd there will be publish'd *A Letter written by a Lady to a Romish Priest upon her return from the Church of Rome to the Church of England*, which I hope will also contribute much to your Ladyship's Satisfaction, and in the mean time, till it can be publish'd, I hope you will not let your self be reconcil'd to the Church of *Rome*. You are pleas'd to tell me I have express'd a great Concern for you, and I assure your Ladyship my Concern is and hath been very sincere, and in the Sincerity of my Heart you must allow me to tell you, that if you make the unhappy Change of Religion you have been so long inclin'd to make, I fear this, with my other Letters, will rise up in Judgment against you.

As for your *Seducer's* Letter, there's little or nothing in it that requires an Answer, however, for your Ladyship's Satisfaction, I am content to make some Observations upon it: First then it is not true, as he, very unlike a good Casuist, supposes, that a *ministerial Mission* is absolutely necessary to Faith or Conversion. For many private Persons, by God's Blessing, have wrought *saving Faith* in Unbelievers, and particularly in the Primitive Times, when Heathen Masters, and Mistresses, and their Children, were so often converted to Christ by their Slaves or Servants. *Socrat. Eccles. Histor. Lib. I. Cap. XX. Sozom. Eccles. Hist. Lib. II. Cap. VII.* So the *Abyssine Ethiopians* were made Christians by the Instruction of some private Christian Merchants. *Socrat. Eccles. Lib. I. Cap. XIX. Sozom. Hist. Eccl. Lib. II. Cap. XXIV.* Some also, *Madam*, have been converted by Miracles, without Preaching, others by the immediate Inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and others again by seeing the Courage and Constancy of the Holy Martyrs have turn'd Christians, and confess'd Christ at the Place of Execution, and were there Baptiz'd in their own Blood.

It is true indeed that the ordinary way of working Faith is by the Preaching of those, who are sent and appointed mediately or immediately by God, and so the main Body of *Jewish* and *Gentile* Converts were at first converted, and this is observ'd by your *Seducer* on purpose only to take an occasion to call our *Orders* or *Mission* into question again. His former Objection against our Mission was taken from the Omission of those Words in our Book of Ordination, *Receive thou Power to offer Sacrifice, as well for the Living as the Dead*, to this I gave you an Answer in my Letter of *February 20. 1702.* to which he did not, because he could not, reply; and in this last Letter his Objection against it is founded on *John xxi. 15, 16, 17.* where Jesus saith unto St. Peter, *Feed my Lambs, feed my Sheep*; from hence, *Madam*, he would most absurdly make your Ladyship believe, that all Preachers in all Ages have been sent over the Earth to preach the Gospel only by St. Peter and his Successors at *Rome*, as the Vicars of Jesus Christ, and that *those who come independently of their Authority are not sent*; so that tho' they may Talk they cannot Preach, because their Preaching and Sending is all Human, and of no Effect to Sanctification. To this Purpose he also saith, that the feeding of Christ's Lambs and Sheep, without any Limitation to Person, Time, or Place, was to come (by virtue of those Words) from the Authority given to and from the Office enjoyn'd St. Peter, and that therefore his Authority and Office is the Rock, on which Christ hath built his Church. This Authority he also calls the individual Authority in St. Peter, by which, without any Limitation of Time, he was commanded to feed the Lambs and Sheep of Christ.

I say, *Madam*, his Design is to make your Ladyship believe that all Preachers in all Ages have been sent about the World to preach the Gospel only by St. Peter and his Successors, as the Vicars of Jesus Christ, and that those who come independently

dently of their Authority are not sent, which I must tell your Ladyship is *false in Fact*, and contrary to the Doctrine of the Ancient Fathers. First it is *false in Fact*, for as all the Apostles were in like manner ^a sent by Christ, as you may see by the Texts in the Margin, so all and every one of them, by virtue of their Apostolick Office and Commission, sent forth Preachers and Governors, to feed and rule the Flock of Christ; so did St. Thomas in *Parthia*, St. Andrew in *Scythia*, St. John in the Proconsular *Asia*, St. Matthew in *Aethiopia*, St. Bartholomew in *India*, St. Peter to the Jews of the Dispersions in *Pontus*, *Galatia*, *Bythinia*, *Cappadocia*, and last of all at *Rome*, where he was crucify'd; and so did St. Paul in all the Parts of the Heathen World, from *Hierusalem* to *Illyricum*, where, by his Apostolical Authority, he planted Churches, and appointed Bishops and Presbyters to teach and govern them, as your Seducer, if he is a learned Man, knows, and if he is not, he may know by the ancient Writers ^b cited in the Margin; all these, and every one of them, as appears by those Authorities, planted Churches and appointed Ministers for them independently one of another, and acted ^c as independently of St. Peter as he did of them, and therefore the Churches were wont to run back their Successions to the Apostles, who first founded them, and the first Bishops they set over them; ^d so the Church of *Smyrna* deriv'd their Succession from St. Polycarp, set over them by St. John, who, after the Death of St. Paul, set Bishops over the Churches which that Apostle had planted in *Asia*, and so the Christians of St. Thomas in *India* so call'd, when the *Romish* Missi-

^a 1 John xx. 21. Matth. xxviii. 18, 19, 20. Mark xvi. 15.

^b Euseb. Eccl. Hist. Lib. iii. Cap. i. Soerat. Eccl. Histor. Lib. i. Cap. xix. Lib. iii. Cap. xxiii.

^c Tertullian de præscript. Cap. 20. 21. 22.

^d Ibid. Cap. 32. 36. 37. Irenæus Lib. ii. Cap. iii. Lib. iv. 63. Lib. v. Cap. xx.

Missioners came to them, deriv'd their Succession from that Apostle, and refus'd to be subject to the Bishop of *Rome*; so the ^e Church of *Alexandria* derives its Succession from *St. Mark*, as the *Abyssine* Church derives hers from the Church of *Alexandria*; so, *Madam*, the Church of *Hierusalem* derives her Succession from *St. James*, our Lord's Brother, and ^t the Church of *Corinth* hers from *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*, *St. Paul's* Convert, to whom he committed that Church, as the Churches of *Creet* deriv'd theirs from ^s *Titus*, set over them by the same Apostle; all these, *Madam*, deriv'd their Successions from other Founders than *St. Peter*, and to *St. Peter* let me add *St. Paul*, who, according to ^b *Irenaus*, were joynt Founders of the Church of *Rome*, which I observe unto your Ladyship because your *Seducer*, like the other *Court-Divines* of the *Romish* Church, ascribe so much to *St. Peter*, tho' *St. Paul* was wrapt up into the Third Heavens, which we never read *St. Peter* was, and suffer'd Martyrdom at *Rome* as well as he. All other Churches, I say, were wont to derive their Successions from the Apostles who founded them, and the first Bishops whom they set over them, in the same manner as the Church of *Rome* derives her Succession from *St. Peter*, and the first Bishop or Bishops he set over it, be it *Linus* or *Clemens*, for Tradition in this is different. I have said *Bishops*, *Madam*, because learned Men, to reconcile the Difference among the ancient Writers about the first Bishop of *Rome* after *St. Peter*, do, not without Reason, think there were Two first Bishops, one over the Church of the Convert *Jews*, and another over the Church of the Convert *Gentiles* in that City.

N

Thus,

* Euseb. Eccl. Hist. Lib. i. Cap. xvi.

f Euseb. Lib. iii. Cap. 4. Lib. iv. Cap. xxiii.

g Euseb. Eccl. Hist. Lib. ii. Cap. i.

b Irenæus Lib. iii. Cap. i. Lib. ii. Cap. iii.

Thus, *Madam*, have I shew'd your *Ladyship* that what your *Seducer* would make you believe, is false in Fact, and let him disprove my Authorities if he can, I challenge him to do it, and if he cannot do it, let *the full of all Subilty and Malice* against the Church of *England* cease to pervert the *Ways of the Lord*.

But in the second place, *Madam*, as what he saith is *false in Fact*: so is it not consistent with the Nature of the Apostolical Office and Authority, which was given in full to all the Apostles as well as to St. *Peter*, even to St. *Paul*, who was not one of the Twelve, *being born*, as it were, *out of due time*. The Care of the Church was equally committed to them all in part, and in whole, in general, and in particular, and, if he is a learned Divine, he knows that the Words of the Text, which he cites out of St. *John*, were directed to all the Apostles, tho' spoken only to St. *Peter*, and are in general apply'd by the Fathers to them all, and to all their Successors, whose common Office it was, and is to feed and govern the Church of God.

If he denies this, *Madam*, I will undertake the Proof of it; but what need I say I will undertake the Proof of it, for it is prov'd to my hand by many of their best Writers, as Dr. *Launoy*, *Richerius*, and other learned Writers of the Church of *Rome*, to whom I refer him.

Doth not your *Ladyship* know that St. *Paul* by his Apostolical Authority charg'd the Elders of the Churches of *Ephesus*, and the Country adjacent, whom he had sent or ordain'd, *to take heed to themselves, and to all the Flock over which the Holy Ghost had made them Overseers, and to feed the Church of God, which he had purchas'd with his Blood*? Did he do this by Leave or Order from St. *Peter*, or dependently of him? Did he plant so many Churches, and ordain Bishops and Priests to feed them by the Apostolical Office that was given to St. *Peter*, or by
that

that which he had receiv'd himself? He saith, *he was an Apostle not of Men, neither by Man, but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father*; that he was not a *Whit behind the very chiefest Apostles*; that James, Peter and John, who were esteem'd as Pillars of the Church, gave not him only, but *Barnabas*, the Right Hand of Fellowship, and acknowledg'd them as their Equals and Companions in the Work of the Gospel, those among the *Gentiles*, and these among the *Jews*. He also, as St. Peter's Equal in the Apostolical Office, withstood him at *Antioch* to his Face, and therefore surely acted independently of his Authority by his own; by his own *individual Authority*, and in virtue of his own *individual Office*, and not that of St. Peter, as every Colleague or Brother in the same Trust and Office doth. Wherefore, *Madam*, to let your Ladyship see the Fallacy that he would put upon you, you must distinguish betwixt the Person of St. Peter and the *Apostolical Office and Authority* which was given to him and his Successors in common with the other Apostles and *theirs*. For the same Apostolical Office and Authority which was given to St. Peter and his Successors, was given also to every other Apostle and *his*, and therefore, with respect to this common Office and Authority which was given to every one of them, it may be truly said, as he fallaciously speaks, *That the Commission to preach, and by preaching to feed the Lambs and Sheep of Christ, comes from the Authority which was given and the Office which was enjoyn'd to St. Peter*, because the very same Authority which was given to St. Peter, and in the same Plenitude, was given to all the other Apostles, and the same Charge and Office was enjoyn'd to them all. In the same Sense also it may be said, *That the Apostolical Office given to St. Peter, and the Office enjoyn'd him, is the Rock upon which Christ hath built his Church, as a Society*; but then to assert that Preachers cannot be sent but by the *individual or single Authority*, which

was given to *St. Peter*, and that the Church is founded only, and exclusively of the Authority of all the other Apostles, upon that, is a downright Falſity, and as inconfiſtent with the common Office of the Apoſtleſhip, as if one of many Judges, imagine the firſt nam'd in a Commiſſion of *Oyer and Terminer*, ſhould aſſert, that the ſole Power of hearing and trying Cauſes was in him excluſively of all the reſt. Or, to illuſtrate the Caſe by another familiar Compariſon, this Doctrin of his concerning the Miſſion, or ſending of Biſhops and Priests to feed and govern the Flock of Chriſt purely by the individual or perſonal Authority of *St. Peter* and his Succeſſors, is as contrary to Truth and Right, as if the firſt nam'd *Trustee* in a Commiſſion or Deed of Truſt ſhould arrogate the whole Power of acting to himſelf; or as if the *Alderman* of one Ward in a City ſhould aſſert, that the others could not act or execute their Office in their reſpective Wards but by his Authority, and dependently upon him; the Pretences of ſuch an arrogant Alderman would be contrary to the fundamental Conſtitution of the City, and ſo the Pretenſions of the *Romaniſts* for the individual Authority of *St. Peter* and his Succeſſors, as the Vicars of Chriſt, is deſtructive of the fundamental Conſtitution of the Holy Catholick Church, which was founded upon all the Apoſtles and their Succeſſors, as Colleagues in the Apoſtolic Power, and who in their ſeveral Diſtricts have been and are equally Vicars of Jeſus Chriſt. This, if he is verſ'd in the ancient Eccleſiaſtical Writers, he knows to be true, but if he doth not, he may ſee it prov'd in their own Writers above mention'd, or (if he pleaſes to caſt an Eye upon it) in my Book of *ſeveral Letters which paſſ'd between me and a Romiſh Prieſt*, who from the ſame Sophiſtical way of arguing, I have reaſon to think might be himſelf.

But *Thirdly*, Madam, as what he ſaith of the ſole, individual or perſonal Authority in *St. Peter* and

and his Successors to send Preachers to feed the Flock of Christ, is *false in Fact*, and inconsistent with the Nature of the Apostolical Office and Authority, as given in common, and in full to all the Apostles and their Successors: so were it as true as he would persuade you to believe it is, yet it would not hurt or annul our Mission, as far as we derive from the Church of *Rome*, of which, before the Reformation, the Church of *England* was a Member, as corrupt as any of the rest. This, *Madam*, hath been often shew'd from the Registry of the See of *Canterbury*, and another old Manuscript Memoire in the Library of *C. C. C.* in *Cambridge*, by several of our learned Men, as Mr. *Mason*, Archbishop *Bramhall*, Mr. *Brown* of *St. John's College Cambridge*, and others, and I challenge your *Seducer* to disprove it. This, tho' not necessary, I could not but observe to your *Ladyship*, to let you see that we are duly and rightly sent to preach the Gospel, and so are true Preachers, and not mere Talkers of Divine Truths: Otherwise, to use his Words, That our Preaching and Sending is Divine, and not Human, and effectual to work true Faith, even that Faith which is pleasing to God, in our People, because our Mission is not only by the Authority, which was given to *St. Peter* and his Successors in common to the other Apostles, and their Successors, but, if he pleases, because it is in part by and from the individual Authority of *St. Peter* and his Successors, from which, *Madam*, I can perhaps derive my Orders or Mission as well as he himself, or any other *English Priest* of the Church of *Rome*, can derive his.

Wherefore, *Madam*, I beseech your *Ladyship* to observe what a Calumny he hath cast upon us in telling your *Ladyship*, That our *Sending and Preaching* is by *Act of Parliament*, and that we call this *sent*; but this Scandal, *Madam*, hath been so often refuted by our Writers, particularly by Archbishop *Bramhall* in his *Protestants Ordination defended*, that,

had he not a great deal of Brass in his Face, he would not have had the Assurance to say such a thing. Pray, *Madam*, read our Book of Ordination of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, commonly bound up with the Book of Common-Prayer, and see if they are sent by Act of Parliament, or in the Name of the Parliament, or by what Authority, and in whose Name our Bishops consecrate and ordain. Indeed our Book of Ordination hath been confirm'd by *Act of Parliament*, as the Canons of the Catholick Church were confirm'd by the Civil Power, and made Laws of the Empire, after it became Christian; and I appeal to your Ladyship, supposing Popery restor'd, as it was in Queen *Mary's* Days, and that the *Missal* and *Pontifical* of the *Roman* Church were establish'd and confirm'd by *Act of Parliament*, and in the same Words, in which our Liturgy and Book of Ordination are confirm'd, whether the *Romish* Priests in *England* could then be justly said to be sent, and to minister and officiate by *Act of Parliament*? Ask him this Question, and observe what Answer he will make; nay, ask him if he and all the Papists in the World would not be glad to have the People of this Land make another Submission to the Pope in Parliament, and to have their *Missal* and *Pontifical*, and the *Council of Trent* it self, and all its *Decrees*, confirm'd by *Act of Parliament*? Put these Questions to him, *Madam*, and then ask him once more, which of the Pretenders to *St. Peter's* Chair was his true Successor and Christ's rightful Vicar, when an *Act of Parliament* in the Reign of *Richard II.* declar'd which of the Contenders was the true Pope, and to be receiv'd in *England* as such?

But in the last place, *Madam*, I pray your Ladyship to consider, That supposing what he saith of us and our *Sending* and *Preaching* were as true as it is utterly false, and that we had no lawful, true or valid Mission in the Church of *England*, yet it will not follow from thence that you ought to go to the Church

Church of *Rome*, because the Defects of the one will not justify the intolerable Corruptions of the other. Do you think that the People of a pretended Church not far from our Land ought to turn Papists because they want a lawful Mission and Priesthood, and have none truly sent to feed them and govern them as the Flock of Christ? What? Because they have none to *preach*, but only to *talk* true and saving Doctrine to them, must they therefore go to a Church whose Priests and Preachers preach false and damnable Doctrines to them as Articles of Faith? Because they have no true Priests to minister for them in the Worship of God, must they therefore go to a Church where he is worshipp'd by the Ministration of true Priests, especially in the Holy *Eucharist*, with a most corrupt and idolatrous sort of Worship? Or because the Church so call'd and establish'd among them wants that Apostolical Polity and Frame of Government which Christ instituted for all Churches, must they therefore go to a Church which, tho' it hath continu'd that Form of Government in a Succession and Subordination of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, yet, as you may observe by your *Seducer's* Letter, most sacrilegiously arrogates and monopolizes the whole Apostolical Authority and Power of *Sending* to her self, and sets her self up as the *Mother* and *Lady* of all other Churches, and her Bishop as the *Spiritual Monarch* of the whole Christian World?

Wherefore, *Madam*, give me Leave to tell you, that before you had hearken'd to his Objections against the *Church of England*, you should have put him upon the Defence of his own Church; you should first have put him to prove that the additional Doctrines to the old Catholick Faith in the *Roman Creed* are all primitive, true, and necessary to be believ'd in order to Salvation; that their Invocation of Saints and Angels, and asking Temporal and Spiritual Blessings of them, which none but God can give,

and the Adoration of the H O S T, are lawful, and that their Doctrine of the sole individual Authority of St. Peter and his Successors, as *Christ's Vicars*, is primitive, true, and consistent with the Apostolical Parity in the Power of the Keys, and of feeding the Flock of Christ. This you should have done before you had lent an Ear to his Cavils against the Church of *England*, in which, as I have said, tho' there were never so many Defects, yet you ought not to go to the Church of *Rome*; nay, *Madam*, were our Church an *Arian*, or *Socinian*, or *Pelagian* Church, yet your Soul could not be safe in the Church of *Rome*, which is responsible to God for so many grievous Corruptions in *Doctrine*, *Worship* and *Polity*, and for which you must also be responsible to him, as soon as you become a Member thereof. I say then, *Madam*, tho' our Church wanted a true Million, and by Consequence true Ministers, nay, tho' she deny'd any Article of the Christian Faith, and were also *defective* in that respect, yet you ought not to turn *Papist*: that, however, you ought not to do; and should you ask me what you or I then ought to do in such a sad Case, I would tell you, that we ought to serve God with all Diligence in the *solitary State* of *Segregation*, to unite our selves in Heart and Affection to those sound Parts of the *Holy Catholick Church* known or unknown to us, to which we could not go; to write, if we could, to any one *faithful Bishop* in any part of the Earth to look upon us in our destitute Condition, as Sheep of his Fold, and to beg his Blessing and Pastoral Letters of Consolation and Direction from him, and to pray every Day earnestly to God to reform whatever was amiss, and supply whatever was wanting to the *Local Church*, with which we could not communicate; by reading to supply the want of preaching, and by more frequent Devotions in private to comfort and support our selves in the want of publick Ministerial Worship, not
doubting

doubting but God would accept our good Will for the Deed, and not impute unto us what we could not do, because we would do it if we could.

This, *Madam*, is what we ought to do, and all that we could do in this suppos'd deplorable Case; but not to turn *Papists*, that indeed would be but to go from one unlawful Communion to another, to fall upon *Sylla* to decline *Charybdis*, to avoid Sin and the Destruction of our Souls one way, to run upon both another; and this, *Madam*, I so firmly believe, that no suppos'd Case, should it happen, could, by the Grace of God, make me embrace the *Romish* Communion; not *Principalities*, nor *Powers*, nor threaten'd *Death*, nor promis'd *Life*, nor *Things present*, nor *Things to come*; tho' I daily pray God to give the *Church of Rome* Grace to reform her self, as she hath done her Calendar, by cutting off all Luxuriences of Additions and Innovations, and setting herself in the same State and Condition, as she was in at the time of the first General Council of *Nice*.

He hath the Confidence to tell your *Ladyship*, That *Protestants* must allow that before *Luther*, it was only that *Body of Christians in Communion and Obedience to the Bishop of Rome* that was the visible Holy Catholick Church. But I must tell you the contrary, or rather the Contradiction, That no *Protestants* allow it, because for a long time before *Luther* the greatest part of Christendom was neither in Communion with nor under the Obedience of that Bishop, against whose Spiritual Monarchy or Sovereignty the *Greek* and *Oriental* Churches did, and still do, remonstrate and protest. Besides, *Madam*, I must tell your *Ladyship*, That in my Answer to his Paper above mention'd I have shew'd the Absurdity of affirming, That only that *Body of Christians in Communion with the Bishop of Rome* was the Holy Visible Catholick Church before *Luther*. He also calls it that *great Body*, but, *Madam*, it matters

ters not how great it was if it was in the wrong, as was the *great Body* of the *Israelites* in the Times of *Jeroboam* and *Ahab*, and the *great Body* of the *African Christians* in the Time of *St. Augustin* and *Optatus*, and the *great Body* of the *Christians* in the whole *Roman Empire* in the Reign of *Valens*, when *Arianism*, like an Inundation, cover'd the Face of the Church. Indeed this *great Body*, of which he boasts, was much greater before *Luther* than it hath been since, and he knows not how soon its present Greatness may still diminish, for had it not been for *him*, who did let and prevent above 20 Years ago, the most famous Member of the *Romish Church* had likely been most happily reform'd.

He tells you also, That *those who separated from this Body were by the Fathers in all Ages accounted Schismatics*, in which artful way of speaking there lyes a Fallacy, because in the Ages of the ancient Fathers other Christians, and Churches were no more in Communion with the Church of *Rome*, than she was with the other Churches, and all of them with one another; and so indeed those who separated from this Body, or from any Member of it, as well as from the Church of *Rome*, were in those happy Ages accounted Schismatics, whether Separatists from the *Greek* or *Latin*, or any *Oriental Church*. Then, as he loves to vary his Phrase, he proceeds again to tell you, That *this Body of Christians thus united to the Bishop of Rome was never accus'd of Error by any of the Fathers*. But here, *Madam*, you must distinguish Times one from another, to shew the Fallacy in this collusive Expression, for if he means the Times of the *ancient Fathers*, or else it is nothing to his Purpose, they liv'd long before the Church of *Rome* was guilty of those Errors for which we were forc'd to reform our Church; and for the same Reason I can say, That the Body of Christians which make up the reform'd Church of *England* was never accus'd of Error by any of the Fathers,

thers, none of them ever did write against it, or any of its Reformers, none of them ever charg'd it with Heresy or Schism, as the Popish Writers do, and so his Argument taken from the Fathers never accusing their Church of Error is as strong and conclusive for *ours*. In the same way of reasoning, *Madam*, I may argue against the Fact, or for the Murder of King *Charles I.* because neither *Bede*, nor *Asserius*, nor *Ingulph*, nor *Malmsbury*, nor any of our ancient Historians, either mention'd, or condemn'd that execrable Deed. But, *Madam*, tho' none of the ancient Fathers did accuse the Church of *Rome* of any of those Errors, yet many of them ^a in and ^b out of Councils have tax'd her Bishops of many great Faults, and some foul Misdemeanors, of which he cannot be ignorant if he hath read the Ancients, and which I presume he may know have been observ'd by some of their own learned Writers.

He tells your *Ladyship* in another collusive Expression, That *the great Body of the Church of Rome never fram'd it self by a Change to Day from what it was Yesterday, whereas all other petty Bodies of Christians came out of the other by a Change*: To this, *Madam*, I need say no more, than to put your *Ladyship* in remembrance how gradually and insensibly Changes and Alterations will creep into all Societies, and to tell you, that tho' they may not be made to Day from what they were Yesterday, or this Week, or this Month, from what they were last, yet in Process of longer Time, which we call *Ages*, they may be made, and perceiv'd, and grow up like the Tares among the Wheat, especially in ignorant Times, while those who should watch are asleep. This, *Madam*, is the Case of his *great Body* of the Church of *Rome*, and the Churches in Communion with it, as hath been often prov'd by our Writers. And

^a In Two Councils of Carthage, one in which *St. Cyprian* sat, in the other *St. Augustin* sat. ^b *Irenaeus*, *Cyprian*, *Firmilian*, &c.

And whereas he tells your *Ladyship*, *The Time was when you ran well*, and asks you, *Who hinder'd you?* I beseech you to tell him it was I that *hinder'd you*, and that *I will be answerable for it to God*. This, *Madam*, I say to your *Ladyship*, in full assurance that you're safe in the Religion of the Church of *England*, and cannot, without very great Danger of the Loss of your Soul, go from her to the Church of *Rome*. How far my Arguments and Opinion may finally prevail upon you I cannot yet tell; but tho' all the Pains I have taken with you may not prove successful, yet I assure my self that I shall have my Reward from God, in whose Fear, and as in whose Sight I have written all my Letters to you, and this in particular, which, *Madam*, is the last you must expect in this Controversy from

Your *Ladyship's*

most faithful Servant,

GEO. HICKES.

MADAM,

THIS Letter will be printed, with another short Discourse, which was publish'd almost LX. Years ago, because I think it very proper for one in your Case. Wherefore I beseech your *Ladyship*, if you are not already gone over to the Church of *Rome*, to remain as you are, till I can send you my Book, which I hope I shall do within a Month.

The

*The GROUNDS of RELIGION
of the CHURCH of ENGLAND, as
in Difference with the Roman; or
an ANTIDOTE against POPERY;
shewing how a devout Christian Soul in
the midst of the manifold Distractions,
and Divisions about Religion, and Pre-
tensions and Claims to the Church, may,
upon these Grounds against all Scr-
uples, rest satisfy'd and settled in Mind,
and chearfully go on in God's Service
to Salvation.*

I. IF he that believes, lives and prays according to Christ's Rules be the true Christian, and by all God's Assurances shall be the happy Man, the next way to Heaven is not to look after Controversy, but Conscience, and to spend my Zeal and Time not in being contentious, but religious, since wheresoever I live or am in the Christian World, (West or East, in what Church or Country soever) it is not my being a good Scholar that must save me, but a good Christian; not a learned Disputant for Christ, but a devout Servant to him; not being of such or such a Party or Side in the Church, but a true Member of his Body.

And even upon these Grounds I may see and discern enough about the present Controversies, and Debates in and concerning the Church. For,

1. I would ask this,
Whether I, being born again, and made a Christian by true Baptism,

1. Believing the *Scriptures*, shall be damn'd for not equally believing *Traditions*? Whether, believing the *Apostles Creed*, I shall be damn'd for not believing, as my *Creed*, the *Popes* to be as *infallible* as the *Apostles*?

2. Whether, making conscience to serve and worship God, I shall be damn'd for not worshipping *Images*?

3. Whether, praying to God as Christ taught, *Our Father*, I shall be damn'd for not *invocating* Saints and Angels, and saying, *Our Friend*, which *art in Heaven*?

4. Whether, receiving the *Holy Sacrament* in both *Kinds*, (confessedly according to Christ's *Institution*) I shall be damn'd because the *Cup* is taken away by a *Council*? And whether, if the *Blood* be said to be in the Body, it be not so to the Priest too, and so by that reason neither People nor Priest are to have the *Cup*?

These being Points of chiefest *Difference* in Religion betwixt *Protestants* and *Papists*, an ordinary and indifferent Understanding may easily judge by the Evidence of those Christian Grounds, whether the Protestant is a damnable Christian.

2. Nay, Secondly, I would ask farther,

1. Whether, to give an equal *Faith* to *Tradition* as *Scripture*, and to a Pope as Christ, or an Apostle of Christ, be not to incur the great *Curse* * for *Additions*?

2. Whether *worshipping* of Crucifixes and Images be not Idolatry, damn'd in Scripture, against God's Second Commandment? Whether the doing it but *relatively* can save it, according to the Distinction of the *School*, in the ignorant ^b People, or learned either, if

* Rev. 23. 18.

^b Ex. 32. 42. 58.

if the *Israelites* were Idolaters for worshipping God in and before the Golden Calf, which was but a *relative* Worship?

3. Whether *praying* to Saints, (confess'd to be an *unstatutable* Worship) ^c be not at least a Sin ^d of *Superstition* against God? And *praying* to be heard and help'd for their Merits sake a great *Injury* to Christ?

4. Whether to *give* the Sacrament without the Cup be not (as Pope *Gelasius* said) ^c a grand *Sacrilege*, and so to *take* it to receive but *half* the *Communion*? And whether the People may not justly doubt and fear they *receive* none, if but *half*?

These being the *Points* and *Practices* of the *Roman* Church, the unprejudic'd may judge whether the *Papists* be not the more dangerous Religion.

5. If it be said there is but *one* ancient, *visible*, *Catholick* Church of Christ, out of which to depart by *Schism* is to go from Salvation, and that is the now *Roman* Church, and this now doth the reformed, I satisfy my self on my former Grounds thus:

1. Out of the *Catholick* Church is no Salvation, because that's the *Congregation* of Christian Men all over the *World*, and none can be sav'd but a Christian; but is the *West* all the *World*? Are there no Christians in the *East*? Or do *Papists* take up all the *West*? Are there no Christians there, but *Papists*? I ask then, Can I not be sav'd because I am not of such a *particular* Church in the *West*? Nor a *Papist* then, because he is not of the Church of the *East*? I may be sav'd then, if I be a *Christian-Catholick*,

^c Sub Evangelio non fuit praeceptum, ne Gentiles, &c. Ecc. in Ench. — Cur Scripturae disertam mentionem non faciunt, non desunt causae. Alanus Copus Dial. 3. ^d Multi Christiani Divos Divasq; haud aliter venerantur quam Deum, non video quod delictum sit, &c. L. V. in Aug. de C. Dei.

^e Ad Majoricum & Johannem Episc. scribens — Sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire. —

lick, tho' not a *Roman*, because I am sav'd by being a Member of the Catholick Church of Christ, that is, by being a Christian.

2. If they say my Church is *new*, I ask, What makes one *old*? Are not the *Apostles* more ancient than their *Successors*? and the Bishops of *Rome* of the 400 Years next after them elder than those who came some 100 Years after those Bishops? And is that Church then *new*, which professeth Christian Religion 'according to the *Apostles* Doctrine and *Primitive* Times? And particularly I ask, if these be not *new* Points in the *Roman* Church?

Is not worshipping Images *new*, establish'd about 800 Years ago? And Transubstantiation *new*, defin'd about 400 Years since? And Purgatory *new*, which came in after? And Communion in *one* Kind more *new*, decreed in 1415? And all that most *new* which came in but about 100 Years since in the Council of *Trent*?

Yea, and for the great Point of Supremacy, was not *Gregory*^s the first who proclaim'd it Anti-christian against *Constantinople*, (*Anno* 600) and all the Bishops before him, of whom not one ever challeng'd it, before the succeeding Popes in the last Thousand Years, who laid claim to it after them?

3. If they say, we are but lately *visible*, I ask, Whether as a Man, so a Church may not be visible in several *Forms*, foul and fair? And whether a Church be worse for growing visibly *fair* that was *foul*? Then I demand, Whether, if the *Roman* Church should reform what many of themselves, as well as we confess to be foul, it should be said *thenceforth* to be a visible Church? And why then others who have done so are deny'd *before* to be visible? And whether *Visibility* of the Church of *Rome* may not

^s Concil. Nic. 2. Ann. 787. Conc. Later. Ann. 1215. Conc. Flor. 1438. v. Conc. Const. 445. Conc. Tr. Ann. 1563.

^s L. 4. Epist. 36.

not as well be deny'd, because, as *now*^b it appears, it was not *always* visible?

4. And since, if another tear my Coat, it is not I, but he that maketh the *Rent*, I ask, whether are they the *Schismatics*, that *cause*, or *suffer* the Schism? Whether dangerous *Corruptions* being *discover'd*, and a *Reformation* desir'd and *sought* to prevent and cure a growing Schism, they which decline, and *detest*, and oppose all Reformation, or they who *protest* thereupon against them for it, are more the Cause? And again, May the *Roman Church* depart from the Purity of the Primitive Church to *Corruptions* and *Innovations* without Schism? And cannot the *Reform'd* return from those *Corruptions* and *Innovations* to that ancient Purity but with it?

5. And since *Unity in Opinion* is the Privilege of *Minds* triumphant above, of which the Churches of the Apostles themselves on Earth were not free, but some of *Paul*, some of *Apollos*, and some of ⁱ*Cephas*, is not *Unity in Foundation* among the *Reform'd* as well as the *Roman*? And Diversity and *Contrariety* of Opinions among the *Roman* as well as the *Reform'd*? Yea, in high Points of their *Faith* as well as *Opinions*? I ask then,

1. *Touching the immaculate Conception of the blessed Virgin,*

Whether the *Dominicans* be not as hot against it as the *Franciscans* are for it? (Both famous *Orders* of *Roman-Catholicks*.)

2. *Touching the Aids, Operations of Grace, &c.*

Whether the *Lutheran* be more fiery against the *Calvinist* than the *Jesuit* is against the *Dominican*? And whether, even in the horrid Point of absolute Reprobation it self, *Bannes* do not out-go *Calvin*,
O and

^b With Latin Service, Communion in one kind, believing and bolying under the Pope as universal Bishop, &c.

ⁱ 1 Cor. i. 12.

and *Lessius* go along with *Luther*? (Both famous Roman-Catholicks of their Orders.)

3. *Touching the Pope's Supremacy,*

Whether the Doctors of *Sorbon* stand not as much against it as the Doctors of *Lovain* are for it? (Both Roman-Catholick Universities and Schools.) Whether *Venice* be as much for the Pope's Power and Prerogative as *Rome*? (Both Roman-Catholick Cities and States.) Whether the *French* Papist profess and give as much Subjection to the Pope as the *Spanish*? (Both Roman-Catholick Countries and Churches.) Nay, whether *Gregory* the first, (the Saint) was not as fierce to condemn as *Gregory* the Seventh was furious to maintain it? (Both Roman-Catholick Bishops and Popes.)

4. *Touching the Pope's Infallibility,*

Whether some place it not in a Council but the Pope, some not in the Pope but a Council, some in both Council and Pope? All Catholicks, Doctors and Champions in their several Countries.

5. *Touching the Bible it self of the vulgar Translation,*

Whether ^k *Sixtus* the Fifth, having damn'd all that use other, or vary but a Syllable from his, *Clement* the Eighth did not put out another, and curse all that use any other but it? So that, according to their Rules of Infallibility in the Pope, the Papist must be damn'd that makes use of any Bible; for both these were Bishops of *Rome*, and Popes.

2. And for Unity in Affection and Spirit, Do our foulest-mouth'd *Settaries* rail more at Church-men and Orders than the *Secular* Priests at the *Jesuits*, and they at the *Seculars*, both of them *Papists*? Did ever, or do the cruelest of their Faction, shew more inhuman Rage against their Opposites than ^l *Sergius* did against his Predecessor *Formosus*, damning all that

^k Vide Preface to his Bible.

^l As *Luitprandus*, *Baronius* says *Boniface*.

that he had done before, (as he did by *Stephanus*) and raising him out of his Grave, and setting him up in his Pontifical Habit to damn him, and wreak his barbarous Spight and Malice upon him^m; and these also were Popes of *Rome*: Are these Signs of all Unity amongst them?

3. If they trouble me lastly with their trivial and frightening Argument to weak and tender Souls, saying, *By our Confession some may be sav'd in their Church, but, say they, None can be sav'd in ours, theirs therefore is the safer Religionⁿ*; I ask whether they mistake not us, and know what themselves say, for their more moderate ones do not think, and our fiercer ones do not say so, and did they all, it were nothing. For,

1. When we say, some of them may be sav'd holding to the *Christianity* amongst them, and groaning under the *Corruption*, (as no doubt some do) is not this in effect to say, none are sav'd in the *Roman Church* but *Protestants* in Heart? For sure he that is *Detestant* of the *Corruption* in it, had he Liberty, would be *Protestant* against it. Do we say that any are sav'd by, or for their *Corruptions*, that is, as meer pure Papists, holding and doing all Things in Opposition to us, and not because of the *common Christianity* betwixt us? Do we not say of those *Corruptions*, That Salvation is absolutely *impossible* by them, and exceedingly *difficult* and dangerous for them, because the *Christianity* which should *save* is so incorporated and mix'd with the *Corruptions* that *destroy*; but with us no such Danger and Difficulty, because our *Christianity* is *purg'd* from such *Corruptions*? Then I ask if he be mad, that, being to pass over a deep River, will leave a Bridge for a nar-

^m Cut off his Three Fingers, and cast him into Tyber, &c. See Baronius.

ⁿ This Argument the Donatists us'd against the Catholics, That theirs was the safer way, because Baptism was not deny'd with them, but they deny'd it to others.

row Plank? Is he wise that, in the great Case of Eternal Life and Salvation, will put his Soul on a perplex'd and perilous Way, when he may go a plain and a safe one?

2. And by that Argument should not every Papist turn Protestant, *believe, worship, pray, come to Service and Sacrament* with us? For,

1. They confess with us Scripture is *infallible*, but we say not the Pope; the *Rule of Faith* say both, but not *Tradition* say we; safe to believe the *old Creed* both grant, but a *new* one we deny; to trust to Christ's *Merits* sure with both, but not to ours with us; both believe *Heaven* and *Hell*, but we have no Faith for *Purgatory*; the Protestants then is the safer *Faith*.

2. And to *worship* God they say (with us) is safe and profitable *Piety*, but to worship Images we say is damnable *Idolatry*; ours therefore is the safer *Worshipping*.

3. And to *pray* to God in Christ's Name both grant good *Religion*, but to call to Saints for ° Help, or to God in their Name, we say gross *Superstition*; that therefore is the safer *Praying*.

4. And in the Sacrament of the Eucharist a Sacrifice *Commemorative* both grant, but a *Propitiatory* we disclaim; a real *Presence* both allow, but the way of *Transubstantiation* we reject; the *Cup* by *Institution* and Primitive Observation we and they confess, a Power of *Alienation* we abhor; this therefore is the safer *Receiving*.

5. Lastly, in our *Liturgy* is no Error (some of them say) but in their *Missal* are many say we; Service in a *known* Tongue is not sinful (with them) but in an ^P *unknown* unwarrantable and against Scripture with us, therefore it's best to come to our Church

° Maria Mater gratiæ, Mater misericordiæ, tu nos ab hoste protege, & horâ mortis suscipe. Rit. Rom. de vis. infirm. p. 136.

^P 1 Cor. 14. 11, 14.

Church to *Service* and *Prayers*; and so ours by their *Confession* and *Reason* is the best *Religion*.

To conclude. Upon my *Grounds* before I build all this: The true *Christian* hath God's *Word* and *Seal* for his *Salvation*; he that *believes*, *does*, and *prays* aright, is the true *Christian*. 1. Such a one is a *Member* in and of the *Catholick Church*, tho' not of the *Roman*. 2. Such *Christians* the *Primitive Times* had, therefore he is no new, but an *ancient Christian*. 3. Where God's *Word* and *Sacraments* are profess'd and us'd by such, there's a *Church of Christ*, and *visible Christianity*. 4. And from any Church in the World that is such I will not, from the *Roman* as such I do not *separate*, so I am no *Schismatical Christian*. 5. And in these *Grounds* all agree, and so there is *Unity*; and this is the only plain *Christian Way* to *Heaven*, and so it's safest to be *reform'd*, not *corrupted*, a *Catholick Christian*, not a *particular Roman*.

And as many as walk according to this Rule, Peace be on them, and Mercy, and upon the *Israel of God*, Gal. 6. 16.

N. B. While this short Tract was printing I receiv'd the following Letter from the Lady.

SIR,

August 2. 1709.

I Have the Favour of yours, for which I return you Ten Thousand Thanks, and hope it will fortify me with such Arguments against the Person, who has been tampering with me, and endeavouring to bring me over to the Church of *Rome*, as, tho' he may gainsay to me, as he has formerly done, yet I hope he can never answer to you, but will put an End by Silence to his farther Attempts. I beg you, Sir, to judge favourably of me, and be assur'd it was not an Itch of Novelty that made me enter into Disputes, give an Ear, or entertain a Thought of changing my Religion, or any other Consideration, but the promoting the Safety and

Salvation of my Soul, which, as was often inculcated to me, could not be obtain'd out of their Communion. I frequently made Objections against the Novelty of some Tenets now held by that Church, particularly against their *Trent-Articles*, always believing, as I now do, that Christ left not a dispensing *Power to any* on Earth, to take from or add to the Holy Scriptures, but indispensably oblig'd all his Followers to observe what is deliver'd in them, and that only: they being left for the Rule and Guide of our Lives and Actions by Christ and his Apostles. In answer to which the Gentleman, whom you call my *Seducer*, and justly deserves that Character, if his Aim was to deceive, told me, that he could maintain and prove that they do not hold, profess or practise any thing, but what was receiv'd, and deriv'd, and deliver'd down by the Church to this present Age from our Saviour and his Apostles, and that the Cause why those Doctrines now profess'd was in the Council of *Trent* defin'd to be Apostolical, and some of them, if any, not till then, was, because they never met *with any Opposition* till then, or near that time, which occasion'd the calling that Council. Now, Sir, if this could have been made good, I am pleas'd to find that you think I had reason on my side, even enough to convince you also to embrace that Faith. And that which most sticks with me now is, That seeing it is agreed on all Hands, that our Bishops and Clergy were not long since, and that for near 1000 Years in Subjection to, and receiv'd Ordination from the Bishop of *Rome*, when most of those Corruptions we now complain of, and say crept into the Church were receiv'd and embrac'd by our Predecessors, with the Obligation of Oaths on them to stand by and maintain the Rights of that Church, and receiv'd that Bishop, *viz.* of *Rome*, as their Head and Superior: I do not see how they could fall off without being guilty of Schism. Pardon this Freedom,

and

and be pleas'd to answer this Objection, because I may have nothing to shock me for the future. I assure you it is my own Notion, not put into my Head by any other, nor have I seen the Gentleman I formerly convers'd with, since I receiv'd your last. I earnestly pray to God to shew me the way I should walk in, and so to assist me with his Grace, that I may live in his Fear and die in his Favour, and that when this painful Life is ended, I with you, and all his faithful Servants, may enter into the Joy of our Lord to all Eternity; with which I conclude, as I am in Duty bound,

Your much obliged

Friend and Servant.

M A D A M,

September 8. 1709.

THough I told your *Ladyship* in my former Letter that it was the last Controversial Paper you were to expect from me, and tho' writing on any Subject in the Condition I am in, is become irksom to me, but more especially writing of Matters in dispute, yet at your *Ladyship's* Desire I will, against my Inclination, write once more to answer your Objection against the Church of *England*, of which you say you do not see how it could fall off from the Church of *Rome* without being guilty of Schism. I am the more willing to gratify your *Ladyship* in this Request, because you tell me you have nothing to stop you for the future, which, tho' it be an Expression somewhat ambiguous, yet I hope you mean that you have nothing but that Objection to hinder you for the future from acquiescing for your Salvation in the Church of *England*, of which you were not only a faithful but a zealous Daughter, before you too freely and imprudently trusted your single self in the Conversation of her subtle Adversaries of the

Church of *Rome*. You also assure me *this Objection is your own, and not put into your Head by any other*; but, *Madam*, tho' it was not when you wrote your Letter put into your Head by any of those Men, yet I doubt not but it was the Result of your many and frequent Discourses with them, for I well remember, and beg Leave to put your Ladyship in remembrance of it, that you made the same Objection to me almost Two Years ago, in the Conference I had with your Ladyship at my own House.

I must also, in order to answer your Objection, put you in mind of what you profess in your Letter, *That you always have believ'd, and still do, that Christ left no Power to any upon Earth to take from or add to the Holy Scriptures, and hath indispensably oblig'd all his Followers to observe what is in them, and that only: they being left as a Rule and Guide of our Lives and Actions*, by which, I suppose, your Ladyship means *of our Faith and Practice*. Wherefore, *Madam*, I pray your Ladyship to observe, that the Charge of Schism upon the Church of *England*, and her Discharge from it, depend entirely upon this Principle. For if we could not continue in the Communion of the Church of *Rome* without professing and practising such Doctrines, *as Doctrines of Faith, which are not in the Scriptures, but contrary to them, and such as are not only additional and new, but doubtful or false, or dangerous Doctrines*: then your Ladyship must acknowledge that our leaving her Communion was necessary and just, and by consequence no criminal Secession, or *Schism*. Upon this Supposition it was our Duty, and not our Sin to go off from her, as far as she had gone from the Catholick Church. Nay, we had sinned had we continu'd unreform'd in her Errors, Impositions and Corruptions, and must have been answerable to God for continuing in them, as she still doth to her Condemnation here and hereafter. Wherefore, *Madam*, it is not every Separation of one Church from

from another, or every Breach of Communion between Churches that is *Schism*, but such as are *unjust* and *causeless* Separations and Breaches, those indeed, and those only, are Schismatical, because sinful, and contrary to the fundamental Duty of Christian Charity, which all Churches, as well as single Christians are oblig'd to observe, I mean *the great Duty of keeping the Unity of the Spirit in the Bond of Peace*. But, *Madam*, when one Church can no longer communicate with another without Sin, then it is not the Church which breaks Communion, but the corrupt Church, which gives a just and necessary Cause for the Breach, that is the Schismatick, and must answer to God for the Breach. To illustrate what I say by a familiar Comparison: I would ask your *Ladyship* this Question: of Two dear old Friends, who had liv'd together many Years in strict and perfect Friendship, when one of them for a *just Reason* breaks Friendship with the other, which of the Two think you is to be blam'd? He who broke Friendship for a *just Cause*, or he who gave such a Cause for the Breach of it? He, for whom it became necessary to break off the old Friendship, or he, who made it necessary for him so to do? For as there are *fundamental* Laws of Friendship, which, if either Party violate, the other is discharg'd: so, *Madam*, I pray you to consider that there are fundamental Laws of Communion between Churches, which, if either Church transgress, the other is free from any longer Obligation of continuing in her Communion, nay, oblig'd to forsake her Communion, lest she should partake with her in her Sins. Some of the fundamental Laws of Friendship are these: *Not to ask or require any thing dishonourable or immoral, or if ask'd or requir'd, not to do it: not to grow imperious, and instead of friendly Compliance not to demand or expect absolute Subjection and Obedience; and lastly, That one Friend should not presume to forbid the other to do any thing, that is necessary for his Health*

Health or Preservation, much less to go about to hinder him from doing the same. Thus, *Madam*, as it is between Friends, so it is between Churches; no one Church is to require any thing unlawful of another, or make the doing of it a Condition of Communion; no one Church is to set up her self as an absolute Mistress over all other Churches, nor to forbid other Churches to reform from the Errors and Corruptions, which they have by degrees or at once contracted, or hinder them by Violence from a necessary Duty, and so good a Work. But to shift the Scene, let us remove the Case from the Church of *England* to a Church not yet reform'd: I will name the *Gallican* Church, because it is, and long hath been more uneasy under the *Papal Bondage* than any other, and because in all Probability, had it not been for a *Let*, not proper to be mention'd here, it had been reform'd at this Day. To lay the Case then in the *Church of France*, do not you think the Clergy and People of that Church are bound to reform from those Errors and Corruptions with which we charge the Church of *Rome*, supposing that Charge to be just? And if upon this Supposition they are bound to reform, then their reforming is a Duty, and if it be a Duty, then their refusing to Communicate after Reformation with the Church of *Rome*, and the Churches which remain unreform'd in her Communion, would not be sinful, and if it would not be sinful, then most certainly it would not be *Schism*? But to illustrate the Case farther to you by another Comparison, or rather by a *Parable*: As God is pleas'd in the Scriptures to compare his Church to a *Garden* or *Vineyard*, so let me lift up my Voice, like *Josham*, and say unto you, with as much Concern as he did to the Men of *Shechem*: *Hearken unto me, that God may hearken unto you.* The *Gardeners* of the *Western Europe* agreed on a Time to meet together, and to unite into a Community, and to chuse
a Pre-

a President, which, upon the Account of Precedency, was the Gardener, who had the Care of the famous Gardens in *Rome*, and the *Suburbicarian* Countries belonging thereto. According to Rules and Orders agreed upon for the Government and Common Good of the Community, they liv'd a long Time in Peace and Concord under the Presidency and Succession of the *Roman Gardeners*, till by Degrees of Usurpation they claim'd and exercis'd an absolute Power and Sovereignty over all the other *Gardeners*, and declar'd the *Garden of Rome* to be the Mother and Mistress of all the other Gardens, into which they had sent to be transplanted many useless, poisonous, and other noxious Weeds, commanding them to be set and sown among the good Plants in all the Gardens under their usurp'd Monarchical Jurisdiction. This made the other *Gardeners* very uneasy, and many of them sadly bewail'd the Depravation and Corruption of their Gardens by the *exotick* Plants, and some of them attempted to weed them out, for which the *Gardener of Rome*, now become absolute Lord, suspended some, and cast out others, and kill'd others, with a Rage, which made the Gardens, and all the Governors and Members of them, greatly fear him, and wonder at his *Blasphemies*, and that none was able to make War with him. In this sad Estate were all the Gardens of the *West*, when the *Gardeners* of the more happy *British Isles*, not able any longer to bear the Tyranny and Imposition of the *Roman Gardener*, and the spoiling of their Gardens, agreed, as it was their Duty, to weed them, and purge them of all the unprofitable and noxious Herbs and Plants, which had over-run their several Plantations, and thereby restore them to their first *Paradisaical* Purity, when there was not among them all so much as one Weed.

I doubt not but your *Ladyship* discerns the meaning and Moral of this Parable, in which the *Gardener of Rome* is the *Pope*, the Gardens of the *West-*

ern Europe the Churches of it, and the *Gardeners* the Bishops of them; the *good Plants* likewise are the Primitive Apostolical Doctrines once deliver'd to the Saints, the *Weeds* the new, false and damnable *Popish Doctrines*, which in the Pale of the *Romish Church* have been long added to and mixed with the primitive pure Doctrines, and taught as equally necessary to Salvation.

What think you now, *Madam*, of the Keepers of our *English Gardens*, the Bishops of our *English* Dioecesan and Provincial Churches? Were they to be blam'd for agreeing together to weed their Gardens, and cleanse them from all the evil Plants, tho' without the Leave and against the Will of the Despotick Gardener of *Rome*? Must they not have been accountable to the great Lord of all the Spiritual Vineyards and Gardens, Jesus Christ, if they had not reform'd the Gardens over which he had plac'd them, and put them in the same pure State and Condition in which he and his Vicegerents the Apostles and Apostolick Fathers planted the first Gardens, and left them to propagate the Heavenly Plants in Garden after Garden, and from Country to Country, unto the End of the World? Did they any more than root up the Plants which he and his Heavenly Father had not planted, and advise their Flocks, as St. Ignatius, (not Ignatius Loyola, *Madam*, the Founder of the Jesuits, falsly call'd Saint, but St. Ignatius) St. John's Scholar, advis'd the Church of *Tralles* to avoid the evil Plants, which brought forth deadly Fruit, of which, if any one eat, he was sure to die, because they were not of the Fathers planting.

Here therefore, *Madam*, lyes the Point of the Controversy about Schism between the Two Churches: If the *Trent-Doctrines*, against which we protest,

• Φεύγετε ἐν τὰς χεῖρας ὁδοῦντας, τὰς γενώσας καρτὸν θανάτου. ὅτι ἐάν γὰρ οἷαι τις παρ' αὐτὰ ἀποθῆσκει. οὐδ' ἔτι ἐν εἰσῆς φύσει παύσας.

test, are *evil Plants, not of God's planting*, then our Reformation cannot be charg'd with Schism, for the Reasons before mention'd; but on the other hand, if they are good and wholsom Plants, of our Heavenly Father's planting, by his Son our Lord, or his Apostles, as your new Guide pretends, then indeed our Reformation was truly Schismatical, and we have been Schismatics from the Reformation to this present Day. The Proof then of Schism against us depends upon proving the *Trent-Doctrines* to be Primitive and Apostolical, which I take upon me to tell your *Ladyship* again, cannot be prov'd, and in the full Assurance I have that they cannot be proved to be such, and as such to have been deliver'd down to this present Age, I tell you once more, that when that is prov'd, I will own my self both *Schismatick* and *Heretick*, and return an humble Penitent to the Church of *Rome*. You say the Gentleman, who hath unsettled you, tells you, that *the Reason why the Council of Trent determin'd those Doctrines to be Apostolical was, because they met with no Opposition till near that Time*. But that, *Madam*, is not true, for they met with stout and vigorous Opposition at the first broaching of them, as the Worship of Images, the Doctrine of Christ's Corporal Presence in the Holy Sacrament, and the Supremacy of the *Pope*, which hath been oppos'd by the *Greek Church* from the first Claim to it to this present Day.

I think, *Madam*, I have said enough, should I say no more, to vindicate the *Church of England* from the Guilt of Schism. But that I may not omit to give your *Ladyship* all the Satisfaction you can expect, I now proceed to consider the Arguments which you say *stick most with you*, and make you think her guilty of that heavy Crime. I think I may reduce them to these four Heads. *First*, That the *English Bishops* and Clergy liv'd in Subjection to the Bishop of *Rome* for a Thousand Years before the Reformation. *Secondly*, That all that Time

we receiv'd Ordination from the Bishop of *Rome*: And *Thirdly*, That we did not only own him for our Head and Superior, but were under the Obligation of Oaths to him, and to maintain the Rights of the Church of *Rome*. And in the *fourth* place, That all this was done when most of the Corruptions we complain'd of were crept into the Church, and embrac'd by our Predecessors.

I take the Liberty to begin with your *Second* Objection: That for a Thousand Years before the Reformation we receiv'd Orders from the Bishop of *Rome*. In answer to which I must first inform your Ladyship, That our Church derives her Succession, I mean the Lineal Succession of her Bishops and Clergy, by a mix'd Ordination from the *British* and *Scottish* Churches, as well as from the Church of *Rome*, as hath been shew'd by Dr. *Bramhal*, afterwards Archbishop of *Armagh*,^r in his *Just Vindication of the Church of England*. The same, *Madam*, is lately shew'd more at large by Two of our learned Divines, Dr. *Inett* in his *History of the English Church*, and Mr. *Collier* in his *Ecclesiastical History of Great-Britain*, to which I refer your Ladyship, and those from whom by Contagion of Conversation you have insensibly had this Objection. If they have read *BEDE's Ecclesiastical History* they must know this to be true, and taking the Church of *England*, as it now usually is, for the Churches in the *British Isles*, probably not a Tenth Part of it owe their Conversion to *Rome*; so far is it from being absolutely true that we originally, or for a Thousand Years, receiv'd our Orders, or Succession (only) from the Bishop or Church of *Rome*. Seeing then, *Madam*, that our Ordination was a mix'd Ordination, like a River made up of many Streams, before the Reformation, it is improperly asserted, That we receiv'd it originally, or for a Thousand Years before we reformed, from

from the Bishop of *Rome*. Nay, I must farther tell your *Ladyship*, That, properly speaking, ' *St. Augustin*, after the Conversion of the *English*, went to *Arles* in *France* to receive Consecration from the Archbishop of that See, so that in your way of speaking we owe that Stream of our Ordination rather to the Bishop of *Arles*, than the Bishop of *Rome*. I must also entreat you to observe, That *St. Augustin* in his Life-time consecrated his next Successor, *Laurentius*, and those who were his Successors, *Melitus* Bishop of *London*, and *Justus* Bishop of *Roche-ster*, who consecrated *Paulinus*, the Converter of King *Edwin*, and his *Northumbrians*, and so the *English* Bishops consecrated one another to the Time of the Reformation, as the Bishops in all other Parts of the Catholick Church consecrated one another to fill up vacant Sees.

This being premis'd, I must tell your *Ladyship* in the *Second* place, That the receiving or deriving Orders from any Bishop or Church lays no Obligation on the derivative Church or her Bishops to hold Communion with their *Original* longer than they keep to the Catholick Church. But if they once corrupt the Faith, or Worship, or Polity of that, or in any one of these Instances, much more in all, depart from it, all other Churches, whether derivative, or underiv'd, are bound to forsake their Communion, and in that Case, as I observ'd before, the *Mother-Churches*, who give the Occasion, and not their Daughters, are the *Schismatics*, and must answer to God for the *Schism*. When *Paulus Samo-satenus*, Archbishop of *Antioch*, the *Mother-Church* of *Syria*, and, next to that of *Hierusalem*, the first of the Christian World; I say when ' that Pimate or *Metropolitan* turn'd Tyrant and Heretick, in the

Third

^f Dr. Inett's *History of the English Church*. p. 230. 231.

^g *Johan. Pearsoni* Annotationes in Epist. *Ignatii ad Romanos*:
 * *Ἐμμοκωρὸς Ζυελας*. Quum *Antiochia* esset Caput, & *Metropolis*
Syrix,

Third Century, the Bishops of the neighbouring Churches and Provinces, those of *Syria*, his own Province not excepted, not only separated from all Communion with him, but rose up with one Consent against him, and depos'd him, and drove him, as a *Wolf*, from his Fold. This, *Madam*, your *Ladyship* may read at large in the xxixth and xxxth Chapters of the Ecclesiastical History of *Eusebius*, lately publish'd in *English*. Wherefore if *Paul's* Comprovincials, the Bishops of *Syria*, all or most of which are suppos'd to have deriv'd their Orders from the Bishops of *Antioch*, did rise up, as well as other independent Bishops, against their *Metropolitan*, our having receiv'd Ordination from the Bishop of *Rome*, had it been from him only, could not oblige us to maintain Communion with his Successors after they had corrupted the Faith, and Worship, and Polity of the Church Catholick, and turn'd *Hereticks* and *Tyrants*, in imposing new and strange Doctrines upon us as *Articles of Faith*, and challenging our Obedience, as the Vicars-General of Christ, and Bishops of the Universal Church. I would appeal, *Madam*, to any ingenuous *Roman-Catholick*, if, upon Supposition that the Pope turn'd an incorrigible *Heretick*, as *Arian*, *Sabellian*, *Macedonian*, *Photinian*, or the like, and had infected his whole Diocese of *Rome*, and some other neighbouring Churches, imagine all the *Italian* Churches, with his Heresy, whether in that Case it would not be lawful for the other Churches to renounce his Communion, tho' they had receiv'd their Orders altogether from a Bishop of *Rome*, as you are told we did? The like I may ask of the *Colony-Churches*, planted by and deriv'd

Syria, ipse autem esset Episcopus Antiochiæ constitutus, non immerito se Episcopum *Syria* appellat. Nam licet *Metropolitæ* nomen ea tempestate non inveniatur, ille tamen Episcopus, qui in *Metropoli* consistebat, aliquod jus habuit in Ecclesiis in aliis urbibus *Metropoli* subjectis, secundum leges Romanas. Unde postea talis Episcopus à Latinis *Metropolitanus* dicebatur.

riv'd from the reform'd Church of *England* in our *American* Plantations: Do you think if we should so far degenerate as to corrupt the Faith with new and strange Mixtures, and impose new Creeds in a tyrannical manner upon them, that they would be oblig'd to continue in Communion with us, because they had their Orders from us? Consider, *Madam*, of what Answer you think you ought to give to this Question, and if it would be in the Negative, then why should we be bound in the same Case and for the same Reason to continue Communion with the Bishop and Church of *Rome*?

From your Argument taken from our *Ordination* I proceed to that you take from our *Subjection* to the Bishop of *Rome*, in which you say, *our Bishops and Clergy liv'd a Thousand Years before the Reformation*. In answer to which I must premise, That receiving Ordination from any Bishop doth not of it self give any Ecclesiastical Superiority over the ordain'd Bishop, tho' sent by him to convert a Country, as *Augustin* was by Pope *Gregory I.* to convert *England*, and plant Churches therein. Much less can the Successors of the Ordainer, merely by virtue of his Ordination, challenge Authority and Jurisdiction over the ordain'd and his Successors and Colleagues, as their Ecclesiastical Head or Superior. Ordination is indeed a good Reason, for which they ought to bear a filial Respect and Deference towards the Ordainer while he lives, and retain an honourable and thankful Remembrance of him in all Ages after his Death, and this the *English Saxon* Church did for *St. Gregory*, in calling him their "*Apostle*," and "keeping a solemn Day of Commemoration to the Honour of his Memory on the Day in which he dy'd, as appears by the Homily appointed to be

P preach'd

^u Bede Eccl. Hist. Lib. II. Cap. I.

^w Concil. Cloveshoo. Can. 17. apud Henric. Spelm. Concil. Vol. I.

preach'd in remembrance of him, which will shortly be publish'd in *Saxon*, with the *English* Translation, and Notes, by * an ingenious Gentlewoman, and a great Ornament of her Sex. But then, *Madam*, what Honour and Respect soever the *Ordainer* may justly expect or acquire from the ordain'd *Missioner* sent by him to convert a Country, he neither ought to expect, nor can acquire any Right to govern him, much less a perpetual Right, not only for himself, but for his Successors, to govern him. and his Successors, and Colleagues, and their Churches, unto the End of the World. I am sure, from what *Bede* hath deliver'd to us of *Gregory*, he challeng'd no Right to govern the *English* Church for himself, much less for his Successors. † There's no such Claim either in his Epistle to *Mellitus* when he came into *England*, nor in ‡ those to St. *Augustin*, § nor in that to King *Ethelbert*, in which there is nothing but *Father-like* Directions, Counsels and Exhortations, some of which were not observ'd, as the Direction he gave to *Augustin* to ordain Twelve Comprovincials, or *Suffragans*: That so many should be ordain'd in the Province of *York*, as soon as it had a Bishop: That after the Death of *Augustin* the Metropolitcal See should be remov'd from *Canterbury* to *London*, and that of the Two Metropolitans he should have Precedence, who was first ordain'd. Neither can I imagine that *Gregory*, who was so humble and pious a Patriarch, would subject a Church to a Jurisdiction which such a great Distance would render so inconvenient, and so great a Grievance to them, at least that he would do it to a new Church planted in a Nation where the old one had always been *independent*, and under no Jurisdiction, but that of her own Metropolitans, I mean the
British

* *Mrs. Elstob.*

† *Bede Eccl. Hist. Lib. Cap. 30.*

‡ *Ibid. Eccl. Hist. Lib. 1. Cap. 29. & 31.*

§ *Ibid. Cap. 34.*

British Church, which had enjoy'd the *Cyprian Privileges*, and the remainder of which in the *West of South Britain* refus'd for some Ages to submit to the *Church of Rome*. Had *Gregory* done this he had acted against the *Eighth Canon* of the second General Council at *Ephesus*, which ordain'd, *That the Bishops of Antioch should not ordain in Cyprus, and that no Bishop should invade a Province that did not of old belong to his Jurisdiction*. By doing so he had also violated the *Sixth Canon* of the first General Council of *Nice*, and so acted in Contempt of Two of the first Four General Councils, which ^b he declar'd he receiv'd and reverenc'd as the *Four Gospels*. Indeed he sent *St. Augustin* the *Pall*, which then was only a Token from the Pope of Esteem and Respect, but not of Jurisdiction. And therefore, *Madam*, I think I have very good Reason to presume, that the Bishops of the *English Church* in *Gregory's* Time liv'd not in Subjection to him for that small part of the Thousand Years in which you are told they liv'd in Subjection to the Bishop of *Rome*. Or tho', for Dispute sake, I should grant that he assum'd a *Patriarchal Superiority* over them, and that they were subject to it with their own Consent, yet then I must tell you, that it was forfeited by his next Successor *Boniface*, who quitted that Title for that of universal Bishop, a Title of which *St. Gregory* declar'd his Abhorrence in Twelve of his Epistles, as proceeding from *Pride, Vanity, Madness and Presumption*, and which he call'd a *Name of Blasphemy*, and condemn'd as contrary to the *Doctrine of the Gospel, the Episcopal Honour, the Patriarchal Parity, the Constitution of the Church, to which it was destructive*; and also declar'd, *That none of his Predecessors took upon him that profane Title, which was a Diminution and Derogation from all other Bishops and Patriarchs; that he could not endure*

P 2

the

^b Several Letters which pass'd betwixt *Dr. George Hickes* and a *Romish Priest*. p. 72.

the Thoughts of it, but made no Difficulty to assert with Boldness, that whosoever among the Patriarchs either call'd himself, or desir'd to be call'd Universal Bishop, was the Forerunner of Antichrist, who, thro' Pride, set himself over his Equals. Madam, your new Guides, to whom you have hearken'd too long, cannot deny this, or if they dare do it, I will undertake the Proof of every Word of it. But tho' Gregory made so many Remonstrances against his Title of *Universal Dominion* over the whole Church, yet Boniface, his next Successor, the Third of that Name, took upon him that Title by the Grant of Phocas the Emperor, who murder'd his Master *Mauritius*, and began to act accordingly: For whereas Gregory, by *Augustin* his Missioner begg'd Leave of King *Ethelbert*, that the Gospel might be preach'd to his Subjects, this new, haughty, universal Bishop in his Epistle to *Justus*, the next Successor but one to St. *Augustin* in the See of *Canterbury*, took upon him of his mere Grace to give him Leave to ordain Bishops as Occasion requir'd; and *Honorius*, his Successor, mounting still higher, in his Epistle to King *Edwin*, tells him, he had sent Two *Palls*, one to *Honorius*, Archbishop of *Canterbury*, who succeeded *Justus*, and another to *Paulinus* at *York*, that when either of them dy'd the other should, by^d his Authority, consecrate another into his Place. But in his Epistle to his Namesake *Honorius* he tells him, That, as Vicar of St. *Peter*, by his present Mandate he gave him, and *Paulinus* Authority, that when one of them dy'd, the Survivor should consecrate another into his Place. Thus, Madam, grew up the Spiritual Monarchy of *Rome*, and it would be a Work of great Labour and Time to shew you how from these Beginnings it grew up to its full Stature under Gregory VII. in whose Time I may say of the Church of this Nation,

^d Bede Eccl. Hist. Lib. ii. Cap. viii.

^e Ibid. Cap. 17. 18.

Nation, both how before and after the coming of St. *Augustin*, till the Death of St. *Gregory I.* as *Mattathias* said of *Jerusalem* in the Time of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, That she who was a free Woman was now become a Bond-slave.

It would take up much Time to shew your *Ladyship* how under this Papal Usurpation over the *English Church* many other intolerable Abuses and Corruptions were introduc'd, which, besides the Usurpation it self, justify our Separation from the Church of *Rome*, and casting off the *Papal Yoke*. I will but name them: As first, the intolerable Exactions, Extortions and Rapins committed by the Spiritual Monarch in Church and Kingdom, so often complain'd of, as I can shew your *Ladyship*, both in Convocation and Parliament. Secondly, his intolerable Encroachment upon all Rights Sacred and Civil, and the Violation of them, both belonging to the Church and the Crown. As to the Church, the *Papal Supremacy* gave, and still gives the Popes a Pretence of opposing the Divine Right of Episcopacy, and to look upon Bishops no better than their Apostolical Vicars, and Curates, and Vassals, whom they might treat as they please, and how they oppress'd our *English Bishops* by Dispensations, Penfions, Exemptions, Inhibitions, Visitations, Tenths, First-fruits, Appeals, &c. would also consume a great deal of Paper to write. As to the *Crown*, I need say nothing, presuming your *Ladyship* knows the History of your own Country, and then you cannot be ignorant how the *Popes* have treated our Kings, and what Claims they have made to a Right of disposing of the Crown even to Foreigners; and thereupon how they took upon them to pull down one and set up another.

A third Cause of our Separation from *Rome*, was the Inconsistency of that tyrannical foreign Jurisdiction of the Supream Spiritual Monarch to the Primitive Apostolical Government and Discipline

and the Liberty, Peace and Welfare of all Churches, as well as of the *Britannick* Churches, which it enslav'd to unlawful Oaths, to professing of new Doctrines and new Creeds, to the great Peril of Idolatry, to adhere to the Pope and his Church against all the other Bishops and Patriarchs of other Churches that renounc'd his Supremacy, and to forsake their Communion.

Lastly, the Claim of the Bishops of *Rome* to their Spiritual Monarchy and Supremacy, which was the Mother of all these Evils, not by Human but Divine Right, made them also irremediable, and therefore our Ancestors, both the Kings, Priests and People, shook off the Papal Sovereignty, which was the Source of them; and for doing of it they were so far from being guilty of *Schism*, that they did their Duty, and had they continu'd longer under it, they had continu'd longer in Slavery, and Sin.

I now proceed to your Two other Reasons for which you think them guilty of *Schism*: *First*, because they not only own'd the Bishop of *Rome* for their Head and Superior, but were under the Obligation of Oaths to obey him, and maintain the Rights of the Church of *Rome*: and in the next place, that they obey'd him, and were sworn to obey him, and maintain those Rights, when most of the Corruptions they complain'd of, were crept into the Church and embrac'd by them.

Madam, In answer to the first of these Reasons, we must examine whether or no the *Popes* were lawful Heads and Superiors of the *English* Church, and if they were, whether or no the Exercise of their Authority and Jurisdiction was regular, according to the Rules of the Gospel, and the Holy *Canons*, or Laws of the Church.

First then, *Madam*, let us consider, if the *Popes* were lawful Heads of our Church; if they were, it was as *universal Bishops*, or as *Patriarchs*. Not as *universal Bishops*, for that Title of Pride, Arrogance
and

Usurpation, was, as you have read, disclaim'd by St. Gregory I. as contrary to the Patriarchal Parity, the Constitution of the Catholick Church, and as Preparatory to Antichrist, and therefore the *Greek* and *Oriental* Churches have many Ages refus'd, and to this Day refuse Communion with the Bishops of *Rome*, because they challenge an universal Headship or Supremacy, to which all other Churches ought to be subject; and for the same Reason they *refuse*, our Ancestors *broke off* Communion with the *Popes*, who, by giving this just Cause both to those Churches and ours, are the true Authors of the Schisms. In short, *Madam*, nothing is more contrary to the Rules of the Gospel, and the Canons of the Church, than the *Papal Supremacy*; it is perfect Spiritual Tyranny and Usurpation, and our *Ancestors*, by whom perhaps you principally understand our former Bishops, were so far from contracting the Guilt of *Schism* by casting it off, and the *Popes* for it, that they had sinn'd had they continu'd longer under it, and then as for their *Oath* of Fidelity and Obedience to St. Peter and his *Regalities*, and to maintain the *Roman* Papacy, with its pretended Rights, Privileges and Authorities, I say, as for their *Oath*, from which you aggravate their Separation, it was for the same Reason an unlawful Oath, the Matter of it being sinful. And therefore those who took it were perjur'd in the very *Act* of taking of it, for which Reason, when they had taken it, they were oblig'd to nothing but Repentance, because it was a *Bond of Iniquity*, I mean of Tyranny and Usurpation over their own, and the universal Church.

Nor, *Secondly*, could they be lawful Heads or Superiors of the *English* Church as *Patriarchs*, after they laid aside that Title for *universal Bishop*, and acted in virtue of the *Regalities* of St. Peter in a most irregular and unlawful manner, contrary to the Rules of the Gospel, and the Canons of the Catholick Church. Wherefore tho' they had never taken

upon them the *Tyrannical Title of Universal Bishop*, but contented themselves with the Title of *Patriarch of the Western Churches*: yet since they became notoriously guilty of the same Tyranny under this Title as under that, and exercis'd their Authority and Jurisdiction in the same arbitrary despotick manner against the Apostolical Constitution in Government and Discipline, and the Canons of the Catholick Church, our Ancestors would have had just Reason to withdraw their Obedience from their Patriarchal Power for the irremediable and intolerable Abuses of it, especially considering that *Patriarchates* were but *Human Constitutions*, and regulated by the Canons of the Church.

What your *Ladyship* saith of the Rights of the *Roman Church*, which our Ancestors took Oaths to maintain, I need say nothing to them, or those Oaths, because by the Rights, to which that Church pretended, were principally meant the *Papal Encroachments and Usurpations*, claim'd for their Rights and Privileges by the Bishops of *Rome* as *universal Bishops*, and *Vicars-General of Christ*, as Successors to *St. Peter*, Prince of the Apostles. And then as for your saying, to exaggerate the *Schism*, that our Ancestors fell off from the Bishop and Church of *Rome* when most of the Corruptions and Usurpations they complain'd of had been receiv'd, and embrac'd by them and their Predecessors: I must first beg Leave to inform your *Ladyship*, that you are misinform'd as to this Point, if you mean that all those Corruptions and Usurpations were always receiv'd by our Ancestors of the *English Church* before the Reformation. The *English Saxons* kept the ancient Apostolical Faith pure and entire. They had no other Creeds but the *Apostles Creed* and *Nicene Creed*, which they call'd the *Less-Creed*, and *Mess-Creed*, and that ascrib'd to *St. Athanasius*, as soon as

as it came to be us'd in the Church. They stoutly oppos'd the Worship of Images, and the Intercession and Invocation of Saints after the second Council of *Nice*, and the Doctrine of the *Corporal Presence* of Christ in the Holy *Eucharist*, afterwards call'd Transubstantiation, to the very Conquest, as your *Ladyship* may see in their Anniversary *Easter-Homily*, translated out of *Saxon* into modern *English* by Mr. *Lisle*. They also had the Holy Communion in both Kinds from the Time of St. *Gregory* to the Time of the *Conquest*, which was about 466 Years the Thousand, in which you say our Ancestors receiv'd and embrac'd the Corruptions we complain of: But, *Madam*, supposing St. *Augustin* had brought them into *England*, and that our Ancestors had profess'd them from his Time to the *Reformation*, yet granting they were Corruptions; and Corruptions of so long standing, yet that very Concession, as I have shew'd, and as any *Roman* Catholick must confess, will vindicate our Reformation from the Charge of Schism. For Error, *Madam*, can by no Length of Time or Numbers of Men prescribe against *Truth*, and therefore it was the Sin and Unhappines of our Ancestors to continue so long unreform'd under those Corruptions; for which our Reformers justly thought themselves discharg'd and from their sworn Obedience and Subjection to the Bishops of *Rome*. For, as I have already told your *Ladyship*, the Point of this Controversy about Schism is plainly this: Whether or no the *Innovations*, *Errors* and *Usurpations* we complain of are truly such? If they are, no Oaths could bind our Ancestors from reforming, because no Oaths can bind unto Sin. The Priests of the *Church of England* take Oaths of Obedience to their Bishops, as their Ecclesiastical Superiors, and the Bishops of both Provinces to their Metropolitans, as their Superiors. But then, *Madam*, they are Oaths of *Canonical Obedience*, for if any of them profess, or determine, or enforce any thing

thing upon their Subjects that is irregular and unlawful, I mean that is contrary to the Rules of the Gospel and Canons of the Universal Church, their Oaths would not bind them in those Instances, and if you will suppose the Oaths they had taken were Oaths of *irregular* and *uncanonical* Obedience, then they had been *null*, as obliging to nothing but Repentance, as I said before.

You cannot but know that People and Priests owe their lawful Bishop, as it were, a natural Obedience, whether they are sworn to him or no, because it results from the Relation they have to him, as their Ecclesiastical Head and Superior. Nevertheless there are several Cases for which they may refuse to communicate with him without Sin, and in case he is obstinate and incorrigible, finally to separate from him without the Guilt or Danger of *Schism*. Just so it is in the like Cases of Bishops as to their lawful Metropolitans, and of them again as to their lawful Patriarchs: when these depart from the *Scriptures* and *Canons*, those may withdraw their Obedience, and forbear Communion with them, and if these finally persist, then those may and ought finally to separate from them, and when they do so they do their Duty, for which God will reward them, and when this is the Case, their Superiors only are guilty of *Schism*: For this is a Principle which no *Romanist* will deny, That those *who make the first Separation from the pure Primitive Church, and introduce Innovations and Corruptions in Faith, Worship, and Polity, and not those who separate from them, are the guilty Party, and the Authors of the Schism*. Wherefore, *Madam*, whether you believ'd the Charge of Innovations and Corruptions, which we lay upon the Church of *Rome*, or disbeliev'd it, you need not have meddled with the Question of *Schism*. For if, upon what had pass'd between us, you believ'd that Charge to be true, how came you still to suspect our Reformers to be *Schismatics*, and our
Refor-

Reformation to be a form'd Schism? For methinks that heavy Charge, if you thought it just and true, should have convinc'd you that a Reformation from those enormous Abuses was necessary, notwithstanding our Ancestors had own'd the Bishops of *Rome* for their Superiors, and not only obey'd them, but sworn Obedience to them. But if you believ'd the contrary, that this Charge was false, then without any farther Controversy or Doubt, you might have concluded us in Schism.

I think, *Madam*, I have put your Objections in their full Force, and hope I have given a full, plain, and clear Answer to them. But before I conclude I must tell you, That it may be affirm'd with greater Propriety of Speech, That the Church of *Rome* rather left us than we left them, for the Church of *England*, by her intrinsical Authority, (which every, not only National, but Provincial and Diocesan Church hath) did only reform her self from the above-mention'd Innovations, Corruptions and Impositions, as in Duty she was bound to do, and the whole Nation (very few excepted) went to Church, and communicated in all Offices, without Distinction, after the Restauration of our Church under Queen *Elizabeth*, till the Eleventh Year of her Reign, when the Pope declar'd us Hereticks, and commanded all *Catholicks*, as he call'd those who would return to *Poper*y, to separate from us, and forsake our Communion; and for this Reason, as well as for their giving just Cause for the Reformation, we may and do lay the Separation at their Door, and charge it with the Guilt of Schism.

There is yet another thing I think fit to inform your *Ladyship* of, which is not foreign to the Question about Schism, viz. That it was not the *Reform'd*, but the *Popish* Church of *England*, both Clergy and Laity, which first cast off the Pope's Authority, and disown'd him for their Head and Superior, tho' in your Sense the Bishops of the Church

Church had receiv'd Ordination from the *Popes*, had own'd them for their Heads and Superiors, and had sworn Obedience to them, and to maintain the *Rights* of the Church of *Rome*. The very same Popish Church which persecuted Protestants unto Death in the Reign of *Henry VIII.* and continu'd Popish in every other Point of Doctrine, but the Pope's Supremacy; that very Popish Church, which believ'd Transubstantiation, and administer'd the Sacrament of the Altar in one kind, and worshipp'd Images, and pray'd unto Saints and Angels, and taught a Local Purgatory, and that the *Mass* was a true, proper, propitiatory Sacrifice for the Quick and the Dead; the very same *English* Popish Church which taught and practis'd all these Errors, and continu'd in them, and in the Communion of the Church of *Rome* many Years after, first renounc'd and disclaim'd the *Papal Supremacy*, and if that was *Schismatical*, then the Popish Church of *England* was the *Principal* in the *Schism*, for which, had it been a *Schism*, the Church of *Rome* should have repell'd her from her Communion, which she did not do.

But to hasten towards an End, that your *Ladyship* may be better able to judge on which Side the *Schism* lyes, and who are *Catholicks*, and who are *Schismaticks* in this Dispute, I will conclude with the Words of a ^h very eminent Champion of the Church of *England* in his just *Vindication* of her from *Schism*: To sum up all that hath been said; who-soever doth preserve his Obedience entire to the *Universal Church*, and its Representative a General Council, and to all his Superiors in their due Order, so far as by Law he is oblig'd; who holds an internal Communion with all Christians, and an external Communion so far as he can with a good Conscience; who approves no Re-
forma-

^a About 14 Years from the 24th of Henry VIII. to the End of his Reign.

^b Archbishop Bramhall, p. 62. of his Works.

formation but that which is made by lawful Authority; upon sufficient Grounds, with due Moderation; who derives his Christianity by the uninterrupted Line of Apostolical Succession, who contents himself with his proper Place in the Ecclesiastical Body; who disbelieves nothing contain'd in Holy Scripture, and if he holds any Errors unwittingly and unwillingly, doth implicitly renounce them by his fuller and more firm Adherence to that infallible Rule; who believeth and practiseth all those Credenda and Agenda which the Universal Church spread over the Face of the Earth, doth unanimously believe and practise, as necessary to Salvation, without condemning or censuring others of different Judgment from himself in inferior Questions, without obtruding his own Opinion on others, as Articles of Faith; who is implicitly prepar'd to believe and do all other speculative and practical Truths, when they shall be reveal'd to him: And in summ, *Qui sententiam diversæ opinionis vinculo non præponit veritatis*, That prefers not a Subtilty, or an imaginary Truth, before the Bond of Peace, he may sincerely say, *my Name is Christian, my Surname is Catholick*.

From hence it appeareth plainly by the Rule of Contraries who are Schismatics. Whosoever doth uncharitably make Ruptures in the Mystical Body of Christ, or withdraw his Obedience from the Catholick Church, or its Representative, a General Council, or from any lawful Superiors, without just Grounds; whosoever doth limit the Catholick Church to his own Sect, excluding all the rest of the Christian World, by new Doctrines, or erroneous Censures, or tyrannical Impositions; whosoever holds not internal Communion with all Christians, and external also, so far as they continue in a Catholick Constitution; whosoever, not contenting himself with his due Place in the Church, doth attempt to usurp an higher Place, to the Disorder and Disturbance of the whole Body; whosoever takes upon him

him to reform without just Authority and good Grounds: And lastly, whosoever doth wilfully break the Line of Apostolical Succession, which is the Nerves and Sinews of Ecclesiastical Unity and Communion, both with the present Church, and with the Catholick Symbolick Church of all successive Ages; he is a Schismatick, (qua talis) whether he be guilty of Heretical Pravity or not.

And now, *Madam*, nothing more remains for me to do, but to beseech Almighty God to accept the Pains which for his Sake I have taken for you, and so to bless and succeed my Endeavours, that what I have written in these Letters may give you Satisfaction, and so fix you in the Church of *England*, that you may never apostatize from it to the Church of *Rome*, which is all Mixture of Good with Bad, Truth with Error, Lawful with Unlawful, Ancient with Modern, Scripture with uncertain Tradition, and which imposes the impure Parts of all her Mixtures, for which she neither hath Scripture nor consentient Antiquity, upon the Belief and Practice of her Children; and while she accuses the *British Churches* of Schism, is herself become, by the *Papal Supremacy*, and making herself the *Mother and Mistress* of all other Churches, a Schismatick from the *Catholick Church*.

To this Prayer for you, *Madam*, let me add another for her: That God would give her Grace speedily to reform herself, to prevent the heavy Judgments, which, for all her Security, will otherwise come upon her like Pangs upon a Woman in Travail. Neither pray I for her alone, but for the *Universal Church*, the Purchase of her Saviour's Blood, that God would be pleas'd, for his Sake, to pour out upon her the Spirit of Primitive Purity, Zeal, Fortitude, Strictness, and Charity in all Places, and to make her Priests, her Princes, and her People in all Nations wil-

ling to supply whatsoever is wanting, and reform whatsoever is any where amiss in her; that she may become a perfect and glorious Church, in one Communion, without Deformity or Defect, and as free from the Pollutions and Corruptions of the *World* as she was before the *World* came into her, and she by degrees was overcome with the bewitching Love of the *World*. To that God to whom I put up these Prayers I commit your *Ladyship*, and with all Christian Charity and Respect subscribe,

Your Ladyship's

most faithful Servant,

GEO. HICKES.

Books written, and publish'd by the Reverend
Dr. *George Hickes*, and Printed for *Richard*
Sare at *Grays-Inn-Gate* in *Holborn*.

1. **S**everal Letters which pass'd between Dr. *George Hickes*, and a Popish Priest upon occasion of a young Gentlewoman's departing from the Church of *England* to that of *Rome*, &c. Octavo. Part the first.

2. The Divine Right of Episcopacy Asserted, wherein is prov'd, That Episcopacy is of Divine, and Apostolical Institution, and that it was the Government of the Christian Church during the Three first Ages of it; and was design'd to be perpetual in it to the end of the World, &c. Octavo.

3. Two Letters to the most learned *Janus Ulitius*, wherein (by way of Vindication) it is abundantly prov'd, that neither St. *Augustine* nor any one of those Fathers, who flourish'd in the Ages before him did, either by their Doctrines or Practice, in any wise countenance the Invocation of Saints. Written in Latin, by Dr. *Morley*, formerly Bishop of *Winchester*, and now made English. **6 AP 58**

4. Seventeen Sermons of the Reverend and Learned Dr. *William Hopkins*, late Prebendary of the Cathedral Church of *Worcester*. Published with a Preface containing a short Account of his Life.

5. The Spirit of Enthusiasm Exorcis'd, in a Sermon preach'd before the University of *Oxford*, &c. The Fourth Edition, much enlarg'd, with Two Discourses occasioned by the new Prophets Pretensions to Inspiration and Miracles, &c.

6. *Spinoza* reviv'd, or a Treatise proving the Book, Entituled, The Rights of the Christian Church, &c. (In the most notorious Parts of it) to be the same with *Spinoza's* Rights of the Christian Clergy, &c. and that both of them are grounded upon downright Atheism. To which is added a Preliminary Discourse relating to the said Book.